PRIVATE LIBRARY
...OF...
GUSTAV R. POETTER.

No. 1100
Date January 5, 1923
Price Nov. - $7.25

JUN 2 9 1961

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

The Church and the Ever-Coming Kingdom of God

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

The Church and the Ever-Coming Kingdom of God

(A discussion of the evolution of a righteous social order with special reference to the mission of the church in the process.)

BY

ELIJAH EVERETT KRESGE, Ph.D.

Pastor of Dubbs Memorial Reformed Church, Allentown, Pennsylvania. Chairman of the Committee on Education of the Social Service Commission of the Reformed Church in the United States. Author of "Immanuel Kant's Doctrine of Teleology"

6415 LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BV
601.8
.K747
1922
51,862

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1922

COPYRIGHT, 1922,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
Set up and printed. Published, October, 1922

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To the memory of two American
pioneers in the Gospel of the Kingdom:

JOSIAH STRONG
and
WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
JUN 29 1961

6415

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION ix

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD 1

CHAPTER TWO

THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE KINGDOM OF GOD 31

CHAPTER THREE

THE CHURCH AND THE EXTENSIVE GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM—OR THE PROBLEMS OF EVANGELIZATION 93

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CHURCH AND THE INTENSIVE GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM—OR THE PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIANIZATION . . . 171

CHAPTER FIVE

EVIDENCE THAT THE KINGDOM HAS BEEN COMING . . . 283

6415

INTRODUCTION

WE are living in the morning twilight of a new age. There are indications of a change in the weather later in the day, although at this early hour the weather prophets cannot foretell with certainty how decided the change will be, or how soon it will come. Some things, however, are reasonably sure. There will be certain reconstructions in our social life—in government, in industry, in education, and in religion. And it is clear also that the reconstruction will proceed in accordance with the principles of a social idealism which is reacting against the individualism of the old order.

The Christian church should be one of the vital factors in the work of reconstruction. But if the church shall assume moral leadership in the new age there is need, first of all, of a reconstruction of her own program—of her theology and of her practice. The individualistic program of salvation which was worked out in the individualistic ages of the past, and to which the church has steadfastly adhered all through the centuries, cannot meet the requirements of the new age. That a social Gospel is demanded in our day is clear to any one who can read the signs of the times. No other Gospel will get and hold the ear of the age. But the only Scriptural basis from which the social Gospel can consistently be preached are the ideals and principles which cluster about the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God. There is no other Scriptural material that will give adequate support to the message which the church must deliver. But this is the material which has been most neglected in our study of the Scriptures; and to this neglect, more than

to any other factor, must be attributed the social inefficiency of historical Christianity.

The most urgent challenge, therefore, that comes to the church in this day of social rebuilding is the call for the program which is implied in the ideals and the motives which center in the Kingdom-conception of Jesus and the prophets. The church must rediscover the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God or fail in the mission that was entrusted to her. Her theology must be rethought and her mission restudied from the view-point of the righteous social order which is implied in the fundamental principles of the kingdom of God. This book is but a feeble voice joining in the summons to the church to make the kingdom of God and its social implications the central or governing principle of her thought and her labors.

In these discussions I shall endeavor to show the church's mission in the difficult task that has been entrusted to her as the specially ordained servant of the kingdom of God. I shall frankly state the issues as I see them and understand them. I shall not hesitate to criticize the church where I feel convinced that she deserves criticism. It may appear to some that I unduly criticize her for her failure to establish the kingdom of God; that I fail to appreciate the difficulties that have beset her in her labors; that I see only the duty that has been left undone. But this is not the case. I deeply appreciate the service which the church has rendered in an evil and unappreciative world; and I am keenly aware of the difficulties that have beset her in her labors. But it is not my purpose to speak of these things, for they are matters of common knowledge. My purpose is to show: 1, that the social conception of the kingdom of God—i.e., the idea of a world-order regenerated by justice and brotherly love—is fundamental in the religion of the great prophets and of Jesus of Nazareth; 2, how the

church came to depart from this idea of the kingdom; 3, that the weaknesses and failures of the church are largely due to this departure; and 4, that the salvation of the church as well as the salvation of society will depend upon her return to the ideals and purposes from which she has departed.

The church's departure from that which was most fundamental in her Master was due to circumstances rather than to willful disloyalty. The church never meant to be disloyal or untrue to the will and purpose of her Lord. Least of all does the church of to-day mean to be disloyal. There is more of the spirit of the Master in the church to-day than at any other time of history. But our devotion to the church must not blind us to her shortcomings. When the ostrich pokes his head into the sand he does not obliterate the things around him; he merely deceives himself. Nor will the closing of our eyes and refusing to see change the facts of history. That the church has departed from the ideals and purposes that were most fundamental in the life and teachings of her Master is a plain fact of history. And that she has failed to adjust and to readjust her message and her ministry to the changes that have been wrought in the life of a growing world is also a plain fact of history. The church is face to face with the need of a radical readjustment right now. If she should fail to readjust herself to her changing environment, as she did in certain similar situations in the past, the tragedy would be doubly sad. It would be a sad thing for the world, and sad for the church herself.

It would be a sad thing for the world, for there is no other organization or agency that is in the least prepared to render the service which the church, as the special instrument of the kingdom of God, is supposed to render and is capable of rendering. Under the spell of temporary insanity from which many were suffering during the war, some otherwise reasonable people prophesied that

the church would speedily pass away, and that the Y. M. C. A., or the Red Cross Society, or some humane agency patterned after the war-service of these societies, would take her place. No one should be so ungrateful as to miminize the war-service of the Y. M. C. A., much less that of the Red Cross Society. Nor should any one assume the rôle of a prophet who is so plainly lacking in common-sense judgment as to feel that the war-service which these organizations rendered, or that the service which they are at all prepared to render, could satisfy the religious or the social requirements of our age. What the world needs, and what it is unconsciously demanding, is the message and ministry which the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God implies; and the Christian church is the only organization that is prepared with the traditions, and with the men and the machinery, to render this service. Not the passing away of the church, but her awakening to a sense of her full duty and opportunity is the thing that we need and want.

On the other hand, it would be a tragedy for the church herself if she could not be inspired to readjust herself to the demands which the new age is making upon her. It would not necessarily mean that the present organization would pass away,—at least not for a long time to come. The church, as she now is, would no doubt continue to live, and would do much good. She would continue to appeal to a certain class of people—to pious souls who are barren of the social passion. But if the church should fail to readjust herself to the new environment; if she should fail to adapt her message and her ministry to the intellectual world that has come into existence since the days of Copernicus and Bruno, and to the still greater changes that are at this very hour being wrought in the political and industrial world, she would lose her power to appeal to the class of men and women who will shape the policy

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

and determine the destiny of the social order of the future. She would, for this reason, fail to be a vital factor in the social rebuilding of the new age. She would, for this reason, sacrifice her supreme opportunity to serve. And what kind of church would it be that appealed only to the type of men and women who take more interest in the golden streets of the New Jerusalem than in the unsanitary streets of the city in which they and their neighbors are living? May God spare the world and the church from such a fate!

How will the church meet the crisis? Will she give the kingdom of God the central place in her program? Will she make the ideals and purposes of the kingdom the governing idea in her message and her ministry? This is the paramount question. The real significance of everything that the church will attempt to do will depend upon whether or not the establishing of the kingdom of God is the controlling motive. The real significance of Missions—whether Home or Foreign Missions—depends upon the end or purpose that we have in view. If Foreign Missions merely mean the saving of the poor heathen from hell hereafter, they lose their primal significance. If Foreign Missions do not mean an effort to save the heathen from their social hell here on this earth; and if Home Missions do not mean an effort to make life in all its departments and relationships livable for all the people, they lose their real significance. The prophetic doctrine of the kingdom of God, or the idea of a social order regenerated by justice and brotherly love, must be made the way of approach to all our problems—our individual and our social problems,—the problems of evangelization and the problems of christianization. It is this conviction—a conviction that has grown with experience and study—that has impelled me to give to the writing of this book the scattered moments which I could spare from my busy ministry, and no little physical energy which I could ill afford to give. The many errors

and weaknesses are matters of the head and not of the heart; and I pray that the good God may overrule them all for the good of His kingdom, or the righteous social order.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my indebtedness and my gratitude to Professor George Albert Coe, of the Department of Religious Education in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, who read the manuscript and offered a number of very valuable suggestions and criticisms.

E. E. Kresge.

Allentown, Pa.

THE NATURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

6415

EVANGELICAL
SEMINARY OF THEOLOGY

THE CHURCH AND THE EVER-COMING KINGDOM OF GOD

CHAPTER ONE

THE NATURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

What then is the kingdom of God in compliance with whose ideals and purposes all our church activities should be attempted?

I

THE TERM KINGDOM OF GOD NOT CLEARLY DEFINED IN THE SCRIPTURAL REFERENCES

WHEN Jesus announced at the opening of his public ministry that the kingdom of heaven, or the kingdom of God, was at hand, he coined no new theological term. He simply made use of a phrase that had been in common usage among his people for several centuries. His audience was perfectly familiar with the term. It was a term, however, that had not been defined by Israel's religious teachers in such a way as to convey the same meaning to all the people.

The Old Testament Use of the Term.—The idea of an earthly reign of Jehovah was vaguely present in Israel's religious thought from the earliest times. The idea was thoroughly ethicized by the social prophets who flourished during the eighth and the seventh centuries. According to the teaching of these men the reign of Jehovah implied a righteous social order—a social order in which justice,

mercy, and peace would prevail for all classes in Israel. These great preachers had faith that this righteous social order would be ushered in through ethical and social forces that were resident in Israel. This was the conception of Amos and Micah, the first Isaiah and the unknown authors of the humanitarian laws in Deuteronomy.

But the destruction of the nation by an alien foe, and the enforced subjugation of the people under foreign rulers, revolutionized Hebrew thought. Both their theology and their religious practice adapted themselves to the changed conditions. The hope of the advent of the kingdom of God was not destroyed. It shone all the brighter after the national sun had set. But the former hope of the evolution of the kingdom through ethical forces in Israel was gone. Religious thought became more and more apocalyptic. Hope became focused upon a direct divine intervention in the interest of the kingdom. The God of heaven would set up a kingdom that would never be destroyed, and that would break in pieces and destroy all other kingdoms.[1] The Lord would raise up a divine king, or one unto the son of man, who would gather together a holy people, who would destroy the ungodly nations, and of whose dominion there would be no end.[2] The longer the enforced subjugation of the nation continued, the more the emphasis was shifted from the thought of a kingdom of God growing out of the existing Hebrew state by evolutionary forces, to the thought of a kingdom of God miraculously super-imposed on the remnant of the old Jewish state. But this renewed state, although supernaturally inaugurated, was still conceived of as essentially political in content, in spirit, and in purpose.

To the contemporaries of Jesus the term kingdom of God conveyed a variety of meanings and aroused different reactions, as the term socialism does in our own day.

[1] cf. Daniel 2/44.

[2] cf. The Psalms of Solomon, 17/23; also Daniel, 7/13, 14.

In the opinion of the zealots, or the ardent Jewish patriots, it signified the literal restoration of the old Jewish state with its capital at Jerusalem. It would conquer and absorb the Roman empire. In them the term inspired revolutionary ambitions. They were ready to take up arms against Rome in order speedily to bring about the intensely longed-for vindication of Jehovah and His people. This may be one reason why Jesus used the term sparingly, even cautiously, in the earlier part of his ministry, and always in the vicinity of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the more religiously inclined Pharisees, and the wiser Jewish patriots who saw the folly of an attempt to throw off the Roman yoke by resort to physical force, emphasized the other-world aspect of this inherited hope. They promulgated the belief that the kingdom of God was a super-earthly state, and that it would be miraculously established. Some of them taught that God Himself would interfere and would suddenly establish His kingdom, while others of their party taught that the Messiah, for whose advent they were waiting, would be the divine agent who would inaugurate the new era. But Jerusalem would still be the center of the new universe. The Pharisaic conception dominated the religious thought of the times.

The influence of the old social prophets however had not died out altogether. The noted Rabbi Hillel, who died a few years after the beginning of the Christian era, seems to have held the view of the social prophets of the eighth and the seventh centuries rather than that of the orthodox Pharisees of the Post-Maccabean period. From some of his reputed sayings it appears that he taught that the kingdom of God denotes social righteousness, and that the new era would be ushered in by natural and evolutionary forces—through education and through the social endeavor of a righteous people—rather than through miraculous interventions.

John the Baptist, although of priestly extraction, and

in spite of the ascetic bias of his nature, represented the view of his older contemporary, Hillel. His theme was: The kingdom of heaven is at hand; repent and enroll as citizens. When the excited multitudes asked him: what do you mean by repentance? what must we do to enroll as citizens of the kingdom? his answer was: cease to exploit one another; cease to tyrannize one another; be just and merciful.[1] According to the Gospels, John came to grief because he publicly denounced Herod Antipas for his illegal marriage with Herodias. According to Josephus,[3] John was imprisoned because Herod feared that he might precipitate a revolution among the masses. Both explanations indicate very forcibly that in the judgment of John the religion of the kingdom of God must deal with our social relationships. The kingdom which he announced as close at hand was the old social hope of a reign of justice and mercy, and of the triumph of ethical religion.

It is quite probable that the multitudes who came to hear Jesus preach had no consistent opinion on the subject. They had never analyzed either their religious faith or their social hope. In so far as the masses, including the immediate followers of Jesus, had any definite opinion on the subject at all, it meant a restored Jewish state, somewhat refined and spiritualized, but with its headquarters still at Jerusalem. The Lord's Messiah, for whose advent they were waiting, would be the divine instrument or agent to bring about this much-desired restoration.

There is something fascinating and inspiring about the term. Even its vagueness does not destroy its fascination, for through all the confused and contradictory mass of current opinion runs a common element, just as there is a common thread running through all the con-

[1] Luke, 3/, 1-18.
[2] Matt. 14/, 3-5.
[3] Antiquities XVIII, 5, 2.

fused and conflicting present-day thought on the nature of the coming social order. This common element is a deep-rooted desire and an undying hope for a better society—a social order in which righteousness, justice, mercy, and peace would prevail for all Israelites. For some it was essentially an earthly hope; for others it was essentially a heavenly hope; but for all it was the hope of a better world to come *somehow, sometime.* It is this deep-rooted desire—this undying hope—in spite of the conflicting and contradictory ideas as to the *when* and the *how* of its realization, that gives permanent interest and value to the Old Testament conception of the reign or kingdom of God. It is the term around which clustered the inarticulate social aspirations of one of the greatest races of history. It represents Israel's collective hope which persisted in some form or other all through their history.

Jesus' use of the Term.—Such, in brief, was the term that Jesus found, and of which he made constant use. No other term occurs so frequently in his discourses. No less than one hundred and eleven passages in the first three Gospels refer to some aspect of the kingdom. But Jesus was no systematic thinker. He was neither philosopher nor theologian, whose purpose was to put upon the market a finished philosophy of life. He was a man possessed by a consuming passion for righteousness—a consuming love for God and for humanity—but he lacked the philosophic interest to define his terms or to systematize his thought. There is no evidence of any special effort to clarify the confused notion which his audience had inherited. He delivered no prepared lectures on the kingdom. Most of his allusions to the subject were incidental. He referred to the kingdom as the occasions arose to demand it. And, quite naturally, one occasion demanded reference to one aspect of the kingdom, while another occasion demanded reference to an

altogether different aspect of it. This accounts for the many seemingly irreconcilable elements in the teachings of Jesus on the subject. And much of his teaching was put into parabolic form, a method of instruction that is very stimulating and suggestive, but not at all conducive to uniformity of opinion. There is no evidence that Jesus at any time made an effort to derive a conception of social organization from the motives which he declared must control life. He declared the principles and the motives that must control us, but the derivation of any specific social organization from these principles remains the duty of his followers.

We should bear in mind also that only the most fragmentary records were kept of the literal sayings of Jesus. We do not have the record of one entire sermon or address that he ever delivered. And even these very fragmentary records were not put into the form in which we now have them until long after the death of Jesus. And when they finally were put into form for general use no special care was shown for either logical or chronological order. The authors of the Gospels selected only what suited their immediate purpose. And upon the material which they did select they stamped the impress of their own thought and feeling.

There is a quite large apocalyptic element in the Synoptic records of Jesus' teaching. As to the source of this material the New Testament critics have not been agreed. Some have attributed it to Jesus himself, while others have attributed it to the Judaizing influence which made itself felt in the Apostolic circle before the Gospels assumed their present form. But no matter what the source of this material may be, we must acknowledge its presence. This explains why some have constructed an apocalyptic or super-mundane theory of the kingdom of God, and have been able to support their claim with texts taken literally from the Gospel records of the sayings of Jesus; while others have supported the prophetic or

social theory of the kingdom with an equally formidable array of proof-texts from the same records. The proof-text method of exegesis has resulted in much confusion of honest thought on this most fundamental and important of all religious subjects.

In this discussion I shall proceed on the assumption that Jesus revealed the nature of the kingdom of God by his attitude toward men and life, rather than through his random allusions to the subject. In the plain carpenter from Nazareth of Galilee we see what citizenship in the kingdom implies. In him the kingdom of God as it is to come here on this earth clothed itself in real flesh and blood, and expressed itself in terms of actual life. We are safe to say that the kingdom of God is a social order made up of citizens who are controlled in all their relationships by the principles and motives that controlled Jesus. Instead of constructing my theory of the kingdom of God from a number of proof-texts I shall deduce it from the ethical ideals and principles which were incarnated in Jesus. I shall derive my theory of social organization from the motives which we know controlled Jesus' life, rather than from certain things that he is reported to have said. This method of exegesis will give us a theory of the kingdom of God that is true to revelation and that is at the same time pertinent to our age.

Of this one thing there can be no doubt: that the fundamental principles and motives of Jesus have social implications which we cannot escape. The principles which are embodied in the teachings of Jesus and which were incarnated in his life concern, first of all, "the life that now is." *Right now* is the time, and *right here* is the place, to apply them, although the full and complete realization of all their implications will extend far into the unknown future.

II

THE NATURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD AS DETERMINED BY THE MOTIVES AND IDEALS OF JESUS

The Kingdom of God is a Social Order Animated by the Spirit of Service.—The key-note in the life of Jesus was service. "I came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister.". . ."I am in the midst of you as one who serves." That expresses the controlling motive of his life. Everything else was subordinated to the unselfish desire to serve God and man. If Jesus had been animated by selfish motives he would have gained a place in "The Who's Who" of contemporary public opinion. The words of the wily tempter: "All these things—and the glory of them—will I give thee if thou wilt serve me," represented something real and possible. Jesus could have become the equivalent of the modern millionnaire in that ancient social order if he would have devoted his superior powers to gain wealth. He could have become a popular hero, the idol of the market-place, if he would have used his unique power over men for selfish ends. But none of these things, which appeal so strongly to the average man, could move Jesus from the noble purpose to serve rather than to be served. He did not come among us to get out of us all that he could for himself, but to give himself for our welfare and happiness. The absence of material reward did not change his purpose. Even the absence of appreciation and gratitude could not destroy in him the holy passion to serve rather than to be served.

In this unique desire to serve Jesus reveals the first qualification for citizenship in the kingdom of God. No one can claim citizenship in the kingdom until the unselfish desire to serve becomes the controlling motive of his life. So long as a man is governed by the desire to get personal gain out of the community rather than by the desire to serve the community he is a citizen of the

world, and not of the kingdom of God. So long as a man places profits, or dividends, or honor, or personal power, or any other thing, above the desire to be of service to society, he is not a citizen of the kingdom of God. Church membership, baptism, prayers, fastings, liberal offerings for benevolence, and such like, cannot be accepted as substitutes for this holy passion to serve.

This desire to serve must become the controlling motive not only of individuals, but also of organized groups of individuals. The kingdom of God implies that communities and nations, and that all organized groups of individuals within the community and the nation such as corporations, stock-companies, political parties, etc., govern themselves by this Christ-like passion for service. Every department of our individual and social life must be leavened by this fundamental Christian motive. Religion, education, art, science, literature, business, politics, *everything,* must be governed by the desire to serve rather than by the desire for personal gain or personal advantage. No one can claim a place in the kingdom of God until the selfish desire for personal gain becomes subordinated to the unselfish desire to serve.

The Kingdom of God is a Social Order that Values Man and His Welfare Above Everything Else.—Jesus was born into a world that placed a very low value upon the individual man. Few commodities were cheaper in that ancient social order than the life of the individual citizen. Material things were valued more highly than men. One class of citizens was constantly being sacrificed in the interest of things for another class. It was a bold stroke of radicalism to take man from the circumference of the universe and place him in the center. But that is what Jesus did. He was the source of a social evolution, the far-reaching effects of which we are feeling at this very hour, when he taught that the social order must be made to revolve around man and his wel-

fare and not around things and profit in things. Jesus was the uncompromising enemy of every tendency to sacrifice man in the interest of things. He never became reconciled to any practice whether religious, political, or industrial, that subordinated the welfare and the happiness of man to any other consideration. He was unsparing in his criticism of the sheep industry of Palestine, because it placed a higher value upon the sheep than it did upon the men who took care of them. He was severe in his criticism of the orthodox religion of his day because it placed a higher value upon an institution like the Sabbath, or a thing like the altar, than it did upon men. The priest and the Levite, in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, became the target of his censure because they placed the formal worship of God above service to a needy human being. In his efforts to emphasize the supreme value of human life Jesus, on one occasion, made the seemingly extravagant statement that one soul is worth more than the whole material universe. Though a man should succeed in gaining the whole material world for his possession, but should lose his soul in the transaction, it would be a poor bargain. No other system of religion or of ethics places so high a value upon the life of the individual as does the religion of Jesus Christ.

But Jesus was no ascetic like John the Baptist. He did not despise things. He simply assigned things their proper place in the economy of life. He valued things very highly, but only as they had value for human life. He came among us as our servant; but the object of his service was life, rather than things. He did not come that we might have more things, but that we might have more life. His purpose was not to show us how to raise fifty sheep instead of twenty five on an acre of ground; but to inspire us to relate our sheep and all other things to the living of a worth-while life. He was interested in things, not for the sake of things, but because of their value for human life.

The kingdom of God is a social order that is controlled by this Christ-like concern for human life. It is a spirit in individuals and in organized society that places man and his welfare above every other consideration. No individual can claim citizenship in the kingdom of God, either here or hereafter, so long as he subordinates the welfare and the happiness of another human being to his own selfish interests. No institution or organization can claim a place in the kingdom of God until its resources and its machinery are directed upon the welfare and the happiness of all the human beings whose lives it touches. A community can never be righteously proud of its thriving industries, its big bank deposits, its fine buildings, its beautiful parks, and its fine boulevards, until it has related all these material things to the moral and physical health of its children and to the welfare of its men and women. The glory of a nation is not the cattle that feed on its thousand hills, but the type of childhood that is produced in its homes and its schools, and the character of the men and the women who work in its mills and its factories. The object of religion, of education, of business, of politics, and of every other department of life, must be the welfare of all the people within the circle of its influence. Nothing can claim a place in the kingdom of God until it becomes possessed by Jesus' holy passion for human life and human welfare. Individuals, communities, and nations are pagan so long as they place their own interests above the welfare of humanity.

The Kingdom of God is a Social Order that Embraces the Whole of Life.—One of the weaknesses of religion has been the inclination to devote itself to only a section of man's life, rather than to the whole of his life. Under the influence of the old trichotomous psychology religion divided the life of the individual into the three compartments of body, mind, and soul, between which it recog-

nized no organic relation. The soul was considered an entity entirely different from its fleshly tabernacle. The two were simply held in juxtaposition for a brief span, but were really independent of each other. The business of religion was to aid the soul, chiefly by means of mechanical contrivances, to escape from its cage of flesh and fly away to heaven. Failing to recognize the organic relation between the physical and psychical phenomena of life, religion was not able to appreciate that such common things as wholesome food, comfortable clothing, and proper housing, could have any direct relation to our spiritual welfare. This one-sided view of life resulted in an equally one-sided service. The physical and social aspects of our life had no interest for religion. A sharp line of demarcation was drawn between the world of matter and the world of spirit, and between our social life and our religious life. The one was considered the domain of God and the other of the devil, and the two could have nothing in common. The things on the one side of this imaginary line were labelled "sacred," and the things on the other side "secular." Religion devoted itself only to the things on the one side of the line. The things on the other side—health, business, politics, recreation, etc., the things that make up the major portion of the average man's life—were left outside the circle of religion's interest and activity. Our physical and our social life were only indirectly affected by our religion.

There are indications at the present time that we may suffer a reaction in favor of a social philosophy that is as one-sided as religion. A social philosophy that ignores the interests of the soul as completely as the old type religion ignored the interests of the body is rapidly gaining prestige. Spiritual phenomena have no more interest for it than social phenomena had for religion. It sees no more value for our social life in prayer and divine worship than religion has seen in wholesome food and a tooth-brush for our spiritual life. Completely ignoring

the spiritual nature of man, this type of philosophy concludes that all is done that can be done for the highest human welfare when a wage has been secured that will enable men to buy a sufficient amount of wholesome food and clothing, and when men have been taught to comb their hair, brush their teeth, and take a bath. Such a philosophy fails to answer the needs of life as completely as does the type of religion that ignores man's physical and social needs.

The kingdom of God is a social order that embraces the whole of life. It implies a philosophy of life that recognizes the organic relation of body and soul, and a religion that ministers impartially to both. All that we know of life is that there are certain phenomena that are physical and others that are psychical; and that these two different phenomena never occur, so far as our finite understanding can discern, save as cause and effect of one another, or as parallel to each other. What affects the one will affect the other, or where one exists the other exists. To ignore either the one or the other is to slight something that is absolutely essential to our individual and our social well being.

The "abundant life" of the kingdom of God includes the physical and the spiritual, the temporal and the eternal. The sane and practical Jesus, "who knew what is in man," recognized the close inter-relation of the physical and the spiritual. He knew that an attempt to serve the one to the neglect of the other would be fruitless. It is true that Jesus was primarily concerned about spiritual things. But that he was also concerned about physical matters—about men's bodies, about the food they had to eat and the clothes they had to wear—is evident from the fact that the many miracles, whatever disposition we may make of them, are almost without exception accounts of purely physical ministrations to needy people. It is clear that he who put the petition for our daily bread into such a conspicuous place in his brief model prayer

was too human and too wise to belittle the physical foundation of our life. The ministry of Jesus included the whole man, his body as well as his soul, and this present time as well as the time that is to come. This all-inclusive service the religion of the kingdom of God clearly implies. No other ministry can lay the foundation upon which a righteous and lasting social order can be reared.

The Kingdom of God is a Social Order that Includes the Welfare and the Happiness of all Men.—Among the masses of the Jews the opinion had prevailed that the kingdom had been appointed only for the children of Abraham. Strangers could be admitted only as servants of the Jews. Jonah expressed the common feeling of his people when he became displeased at the proposition of Jehovah to save the Ninevites. Jonah would rather have seen the Ninevites destroyed than forgiven. The idea of a brother-hood world, a world in which the Gentiles would be on an equality with the favorite children of Jehovah, had not entered the mind of the masses of the Jews.

The great contribution of the Hebrew prophets of the eighth and the seventh centuries, as we saw in the preceding section, was that they conceived of the reign of Jehovah in terms of social righteousness. In their conception of a social order of justice and righteousness, of mercy and peace, those great men were not only the forerunners of Jesus, but they were his equals. Nothing that Jesus ever said or did surpasses the passion of men like Amos, Hosea, Micah, the first Isaiah, and the authors of the humane legislation of Deuteronomy, in their zeal for a new social order in which justice, mercy, and peace were to prevail. Sone of these prophets so far transcended the provincialism of their day and race as to conceive of the possibility of the universal reign of Jehovah —a world in which all other races would be admitted to the privileges and the blessings of Jehovah's love and care.

While Jesus did not surpass his predecessors in the

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOG

intensity of his zeal for social justice, he did surpass them all in the breadth of his world out-look. What his predecessors thought of as a possibility, Jesus declared as a plain fact. With Jesus it was not a desire or a hope, but a fact, that the kingdom of God, of which he declared himself to be the king, embraces all the races of the earth. There can be no mistake about this. Both his language and his conduct make his position unmistakably clear. He said: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice." When the Samaritan woman said: "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship," Jesus replied: "Believe me, the hour cometh when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father.". . . "But the hour cometh . . . when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." By his sacrificial death he hoped ultimately to draw unto himself not only all Jews, but all men. He prophesied that there would be a time when the people would come, not from Dan and Beersheba, but from the East and from the West, and would sit down in his kingdom. His disciples would be the light, not only of Jerusalem, but of the world; and the salt, not only of Palestine, but of the earth. He removed all physical and local barriers such as descent from father Abraham and habitation in the Promised Land, when he made the will to live the unselfish life the only ground of entrance into the kingdom. He ignored the Jewish racial prejudice and ministered freely to the citizens of Sychar and to the woman of Syro-Phœnicia. When he defined our neighbor as any one who is in need of our service, though he be an alien and an enemy, he showed in the most concrete and forceful way possible, that service in the kingdom of God is not limited by the accidents of race or birth. Nothing limits service in the kingdom of God but the absence of need. Nothing is clearer in the teaching of Jesus than

that the kingdom of God includes the welfare and the happiness of all the races of men. No one dominant race, whether Jew or Roman, Teuton or Anglo-Saxon, whether white or yellow, may monopolize the privileges and the blessings of God's bounties and grace. The kingdom of God is a brotherhood of all the races of the earth.

Nor may the good things of life become monopolized by any class of people within the same race or nation. The privileges and blessings of the kingdom are not meant for any particular class of people to the exclusion of other classes. The Great Creator who so bountifully endowed the earth, who put into the soil, the water, and the air, all the raw material that is necessary for the whole human race to live, is our Father. He is the Father not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles; and not of any privileged class among the Jews or among the Gentiles, but of all classes. He is the Father of the thin-blooded proletarians as well as of the blue-blooded aristocrats. The universal Fatherhood of God implies that the good things that have been created by the common Father are intended for the welfare and the happiness of all His children down to the very last one. If it does not mean this then it means nothing that is real. If it does not mean this then it contradicts our moral sense of fatherhood. If we do not mean this practical brotherhood—this justice and fairness in the use of the good things of life—when we preach the divine Fatherhood, then is our preaching but "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal."

The kingdom of God, viewed in the light of Jesus' fundamental doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God, is a social order whose citizens are all brothers and sisters, and who treat each other as brothers and sisters in all their dealings with each other. It is a social order controlled by the family spirit. All the children, big and little, weak and strong, are to enjoy the rights and privi-

leges of the good Father's house and home. Each member of the great family is to contribute his share to the welfare and happiness of all. No one may shirk his duty and still be a worthy child. No one may use his superior advantages of experience, of skill, or of strength, to deprive the weaker brothers and sisters of their rightful share of the joys and the privileges which belong to every member of the common family. No individual can claim citizenship in the kingdom of God who, by anything that he is or does, deprives one single child of the Father of the opportunity to live a full and happy life. *The kingdom of God is a brotherhood-world, a family-world, everybody's world.*

The prophetic doctrine of the kingdom of God, or the idea of a social order regenerated by the controlling motives of the prophets and Jesus, must be given the central place in our religious program. It must be made the central thing in theology, in religious education, in evangelization, and in christianization. The underlying purpose of all our religious activities must be the establishing of a social order founded upon the fundamental Christian doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God and its corollary: the universal brotherhood of man. This is our supreme Christian task. Nothing must be allowed to turn us from it.

But the establishing of such an ideal social order, in such a selfish world like ours, requires, finally, the venturesome faith and the sublime courage of our Master.

The Establishing of the Kingdom of God is a Venture of Faith.—One of the persistent obstacles in the way of the coming of the kingdom of God on earth has been the lack of confidence in what it implies. Constructive efforts in the interest of the kingdom presuppose faith of the maturest type.

We must, first of all, have faith in the soundness of the

social principles of the kingdom. We must believe that the kingdom of God ought to come before we will make any efforts to have it come. One type of philosophy, of which Friederich Nietzsche, of Germany, was the most consistent and fearless exponent, has denied the moral validity of the ideals and principles of the kingdom of God. The ideals of the kingdom are declared to be contrary to nature and, therefore, not only impracticable, but morally unsound. This philosophy constructs the laws for human society in strict compliance with the laws of nature. In the jungle each species of animal arms itself for offensive and defensive warfare with every other species. And within the same species, each animal lives for itself without regard for the other individuals of the species. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. It is this self-centered individualism, we are told, that has resulted in strong, fleet, and cunning animals. The weak perish in the struggle for existence, while the strong and the fit survive to perpetuate the species.

This anti-social law of the jungle must, according to the teachings of this philosophy, be made the rule for human life. Each race must be inspired to preserve its own life regardless of other races. And each individual must be taught to seek his own welfare regardless of the welfare of other individuals. It is only through the constant struggle for our own interests that hardy races and hardy individuals can be developed. Any kind of social idealism that contradicts this plain law of the jungle and the type of animal hardihood that results from its practice, is denounced as unnatural and immoral. Nietzsche called Jesus Christ the greatest fool that ever lived and his religion of brotherly love and of sacrifice the most pernicious teaching with which the human race was ever cursed.

Applied to matters of government this type of philosophy will give us the militaristic state which ruthlessly plunders and destroys other states. Applied to industry

it will give us the monopolist who destroys his competitors in his own interest, and the profiteer who corners the food supply of the community to enrich himself. Applied to the citizenship of the community in general it will give us efficient brutes instead of brothers of men. It is needless to say that the kingdom of God can make no progress where the atmosphere is contaminated by such a philosophy of life. Constructive efforts in the interest of the kingdom of God will not be made until men believe that its social principles are sound. Not until men have the conviction that the kingdom of God *ought* to come, will they make any efforts to *have* it come.

But we must have faith not only in the soundness of the social ideals of the kingdom, but also in their practicability. We must not only believe that the kingdom of God *ought* to come, but also that it *can* come. More damaging to the progress of the kingdom of God than the brutal philosophy of the jungle, is the attitude of men who profess faith in the moral validity of the kingdom-ideals, but deny their practicability in actual life. The worst kind of atheism is that of respectable and influential men who admit that our human relationships ought to be governed by the social ideals of the kingdom, but deny that such a thing is possible. Our Christian churches are full of this type of atheist. Many of the leaders in our church activities are wholly devoid of faith in the practicability of the ideals of the kingdom in the affairs of politics and industry. These ideals serve as beautiful themes to preach about in the churches, but there is a dearth of faith in the possibility of practicing them in the market place and in the senate chamber. Jesus once complained that men were more ready to believe him when he spoke of earthly things than they were when he spoke of heavenly things. If he were here today he might have to reverse that complaint. We are quite ready to believe him when he speaks of heavenly things, but we are reluctant to believe him when he speaks of earthly things.

We are quite ready to admit that Jesus knows how the affairs of heaven should be conducted, but we tell him bluntly that we have no confidence in him when he speaks of the principles and the motives that should govern us in business and politics. There is a very common feeling, even among good church people, that the kingdom of God is too ideal for this real world. Its ideals may do for the society of angels, but not for the society of flesh and blood men and women.

The other-world type of religion, which has held such a conspicuous place in the progress of Christianity, has systematically cultivated a lack of confidence in the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God. It has denied the possibility of the advent of the kingdom into this present evil world. The present world-order is declared to be in the clutches of the devil without any hope of its redemption. The only hope is to get as many individuals as possible safely out of this lost world before the crash of doom will come. The church, like Noah's Ark, has been divinely commissioned to convey as many individuals as can be induced to enter it out of this world into the BEYOND, where the kingdom of God begins. Pre-millennarianism, which unfortunately gained new prestige during the war, professes devout faith in the ideals of the kingdom of God. It ardently hopes and prays for the coming of the kingdom; but it is entirely devoid of faith in the coming of the kingdom of God into this evil world. It looks for the miraculous destruction of the present social order, but not for its ethical transformation. Pre-millennarianism is blocking the way of the kingdom by systematically destroying faith in its practicability. The pious other-worldling is as much of a hindrance to the progress of the kingdom of God as is the unregenerated church man who delights to hear his pastor preach about the social ideals of Jesus, while he persists in conducting his business according to the laws of the jungle. Not until we believe that the

kingdom of God *can* come will we make any constructive efforts to *have* it come.

Faith in the practicability of the ideals of the kingdom must be grounded in a prior faith in human nature,—faith in the ability of men to respond to the challenge of ideals. The faith which the kingdom of God implies is not a blind trust. It is not a rash venture in which reason deserts us. It is something eminently rational. It clearly foresees the difficulties of so great and so unselfish a task as the establishing of the kingdom of God imposes upon us. It foresees not only the moral inertia of the mass of mankind, but also the inevitable antagonism and opposition of the brute selfishness which is incarnated in human nature and in our social institutions. The old selfish order will not die without a struggle; and the new order will not be born without pain and blood. But the faith which the kingdom of God implies recognizes the possibility of a second birth of individuals and of the social order itself. The human nature that is innately selfish is also innately unselfish. Man is only partly animal. He is also partly God. And we must have faith that the kingdom of God can be built upon that which is divine in human nature.

Such was the faith of Jesus. He began building the kingdom of God upon the foundations which were already laid in the moral nature of man and in the culture of the ages. He grafted the social ideals of the kingdom of God upon the selfish human nature which he found in Palestine, in faith that the graft would grow; and he was not mistaken. He impregnated the selfish human nature which he found on the street and in the market-place with the social ideals of the kingdom, in faith that the selfish nature would be born again as an unselfish nature; and he was not deceived. No one recognized the power of selfishness and the hideous reality of sin more keenly than Jesus. But in spite of this, he trusted men where his contemporaries doubted. He had faith even in the ability of the

publicans and the sinners—the outcasts of society—to respond to his kindness and his confidence in them; and his faith was rewarded. In the most trying hour of his ministry he said: "If I be lifted up, I will draw all men unto me." That was a majestic expression of faith in the universal ability of men to respond, *under proper conditions,* to the challenge of the unselfish ideals which the cross represents.

It is upon such faith in human nature that the kingdom of God must be built. Confidence in the social instincts of men,—faith in the ability of men to respond to the challenge of the ideals of the kingdom when properly confronted with them, *and under favorable conditions*, is one of the essential requisites for constructive efforts in the interest of a better and a more just world. Every forward step in democracy has been a venture of faith,—faith in ideals, and faith in the ability of men to respond to the challenge of ideals. Democracy and brotherhood, which are only other names for the kingdom of God, can make no progress apart from faith in ideals and faith in men. The curse of the ancient and the medieval social order was the belief that the masses were animals who could neither be trusted nor educated.

Our faith in men and in ideals must ultimately be grounded in faith in God. Jesus' faith in men, as well as his faith in the possibilities of the kingdom of God, was grounded in his faith in God. He trusted man because man is a child of God. In the judgment of Jesus, man is something more than "an animated clod of earth." He is more than an intelligent animal, who cannot be trained to respond to anything higher than the cravings of his stomach. The God in whom Jesus believed would not be the author of a human nature that could not be educated to respond to the social ideals of the kingdom. Since man is a child of God he has within him the possibilities, if properly nurtured, to manifest the traits of the Father Himself. It was his unique faith in God that gave Jesus

his unique faith in men. And it was this same faith that gave him his unique confidence in the ultimate victory of the principles which he taught. The kingdom rests upon the heart of God himself. The infinite resources of God are back of it; therefore it cannot fail. Jesus' faith in God was the source of his social optimism and of his moral courage. The kingdom might now be small and insignificant as the mustard seed, but it would become the biggest thing in the world because God is in it. The seed which he sowed, and which seemed to die in the furrows where he sowed it, would sprout and increase forever, because the eternal God is interested in it. The kingdom of God would come, because it is the will of God that it shall come; and His will, though it may be temporarily obstructed, cannot be defeated in the end. It was his faith in God that made Jesus the greatest moral hero of history. He was alone, yet not alone, for God the Father was with him. They might crucify him, but they could not defeat him, because a life dedicated to the cause of the eternal God cannot be defeated.

It is because of our faith in God that the Christian conception of the kingdom furnishes a motive power for social service that cannot be generated in any other way. Our Christian faith relates us to our fellow man, and inspires us to serve him, as no other philosophy of life does. Because of his relation to God the Father, man is infinitely worthy of the sacrificial service which the kingdom of God bids us render. It is no mere creature of time, who to-day is and to-morrow will be consigned to the scrap-heap of the universe to be worked over again, whom we are asked to serve in the kingdom of God. The object of our service is a child of God,—a being whose moral relation to God gives him a value far above all material things. And because we are children of the same Father God, my neighbor and I are brothers, *real brothers*, though his skin may be black and mine white. No other conception of our human relationship can make service and sacri-

fice as natural and as easy as this Christian conception does.

And our Christian faith that it is the will of God that such a brotherhood-world shall come gives us courage to work for this end. Since it is the will of God that such a world shall come we are confident that no selfish powers will be able to persist eternally against it. As the stars in their courses are said to have fought against Sisera and his hosts in the days of Deborah and Barak, so the goodness and the unselfishness that are at the heart of the universe will fight against the selfishness that is blocking the way of the kingdom of God.

It was at this point that Immanuel Kant, the keenest ethical analyst of all times, discovered the need of faith in God. After he had proved that the human understanding is so constituted as to be unable to know whether there is a God or not, he discovered the absolute need of faith in a good God in order to encourage us in our efforts to live up to the arduous duties which our own moral nature imposes upon us.[1] Kant meant to say that if it were not for the faith that somehow infinite goodness is backing us up in our efforts to be what we ought to be and to do what we ought to do we might become the victims of moral fatalism. And he is right. Kant's argument has a social as well as an individual significance. If it were not for our faith in a good God who wills a righteous social order, and who somehow places his infinite moral resources at our disposal, we might well despair of the possibility of ever realizing on this earth such ideal human relationships as the kingdom of God implies. But since we believe that the good God wills it, we have the courage to do our bit, believing that in the slow but sure progress of social evolution no efforts for righteousness will be wasted or defeated.

[1] See: The Critique of the Practical Reason, also The Critique of Judgment.

The Establishing of the Kingdom of God Presupposes the Spirit of Sacrifice.—The establishing of the kingdom of God in an unsocial world like ours requires not only the vision and the faith of Jesus, but also his sacrificial spirit and his moral courage. If the kingdom of God shall be established, the followers of Christ must be willing to make sacrifices that others may have more life; and some of them, like their Master, may be asked to make the supreme sacrifice for the sake of those social ends which the kingdom of God sets before us. The twentieth century heralds of the kingdom must expect to find the same stubborn opposition that the prophets and Jesus found in their day. If Jesus himself were here to-day and would preach as he did in Palestine, I have no doubt that orthodox religion and predatory politics would combine to get him out of the way as they did then. While the law of the land would not permit his crucifixion, he would be declared a dangerous and undesirable citizen and would be ostracized from polite society. It cannot be expected to be otherwise in a world that is still so largely controlled by the jungle spirit. The recent social revival in certain sections of the church is provoking the same relentless reaction that persecuted the prophets and crucified Jesus.

For example, the Lusk Legislative Commission of New York State recently issued several volumes under the caption: "Revolutionary Radicalism." The report mentions by name Catholic priests, theological professors, and a number of ministers of various denominations who are guilty (in the judgment of the Commission) of "revolutionary radicalism." But the radicalism of which these men are accused is simply the radicalism of Jesus of Nazareth. One specific object of the report is to intimidate the prophets of the kingdom, and to discredit them before the unthinking public. The Pittsburgh Employers Association, in an open letter addressed to the secretaries of all Correspondent Employers As-

sociations, has threatened the discontinuance of all moral and financial support of the Y. W. C. A., and of all the churches affiliated with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The assumed reason for this drastic action is (to quote their own words) that "the industrial program adopted by the national council of the Y. W. C. A. is detrimental to our American institutions"; and "that radical and bolshevik elements in our churches are coöperating through the Federal Council." What certain employers consider as "bolshevistic and revolutionary" may be inferred from a statement in the issue of *Industry* for July 15, 1920, in which an attack is made on one of the secretaries of the Federal Council on the ground that "he intimated that the teachings of Jesus Christ should be brought into the industrial field, and that the cardinal principles of the Sermon on the Mount should be injected by the churches into industrial relations." Certain wealthy reactionaries refuse to give any further financial support to the official boards and the schools of their denomination because they teach the social Gospel of the kingdom of God. It is an effort to starve the boards of the church and the schools of the prophets into submission to the dictates of wealth. In "The Beast," Judge Ben Lindsey shows his appreciation of the dangers to which those preachers are exposed who dare to preach the principles of the kingdom in the many congregations throughout the country whose ruling spirits prosper on the violation of these very principles. There are many individual ministers, teachers, and social workers, who are being doomed to social martyrdom because they persist in preaching and teaching the constructive radicalism which follows from the ideals and the motives of Jesus as naturally as warmth follows sunshine.

It is not enough that we see the social implications of the ideals of Jesus, and that we have faith in their soundness and practicability. We must also have the courage to give expression to our convictions in a world that criticizes and

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLO

threatens us. Apart from an intrepid courage and the spirit of sacrifice the kingdom of God, or the brotherhood-world, will not be established.

We can understand the death of Jesus only as we approach it from this social angle. His death was no mere dramatic stage performance such as orthodox theology has made of it. The tragic sacrifice on Calvary was real. There never was a sacrifice that was more real than that of Jesus of Nazareth. It was an heroic sacrifice for the principles of the kingdom of God in a world that did not believe in them. That he would have to surrender his convictions or make the supreme sacrifice was clearly foreseen by him for some time. Several months before the tragic end came he said: "I am the good shepherd." . . . "The good shepherd will give his life for the sheep." . . . "I came, not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give my life a ransom for many." Jesus did not invite persecution as the fanatic or the zealot sometimes does. That he shrank from the awful sacrifice, as any normal man would, is evident from his agonizing prayers in the garden. But while he did not court martyrdom, neither was he frightened nor disheartened by the chilling shadow of the cross when it flung itself across the path that led to duty. He might have saved his life by renouncing the principles for which he stood; and he knew this right well. But his devotion to his ideals made it impossible for him to surrender to the enemy. He would suffer death rather than be untrue to himself. He faced death, even the death of the cross, rather than be a traitor to his convictions. It was a majestic manifestation of that sacrificial spirit which the establishing of the kingdom of God in a selfish world pre-supposes.

The social theory of the kingdom of God may not be able to offer us the complacent peace of mind that is produced by the belief that God has accepted the super-meritoriousness of the sacrificial death of Jesus and has credited it to us because we have joined the church and

said our prayers. On the contrary, the social theory of the kingdom requires of each individual Christian not only the social vision of the prophets and Jesus, but also their heroic spirit. It demands of each individual Christian the willingness, if the occasion should necessitate it, to shed his own blood for the sake of the ideals and the principles for which Jesus shed his blood. Our Christian theology must readjust itself to the stern fact that the kingdom of God cannot be established on this earth of ours save through the spirit of sacrifice for principles. Then:

> "Trumpeter, sound for the splendor of God!
> Sound the music whose name is law,
> Whose service is perfect freedom still,
> The order august that rules the stars!
> Bid the anarchs of night withdraw.
> Too long the destroyers have worked their will.
> Sound for the last, the last of the wars!
> Sound for the heights our fathers trod,
> When truth was truth and love was love,
> With a hell beneath, but a heaven above,
> Trumpeter, rally us, rally us, rally us,
> On to the City of God."

THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE KINGDOM OF GOD

CHAPTER TWO

THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH TO THE KINGDOM OF GOD

THERE has been a very general identification of the church and the kingdom of God. "The church militant" has been identified with the kingdom on earth, and "the church triumphant" with the kingdom in its future or heavenly consummation. To millions of present-day Christians—perhaps to the majority of Christians—entering the kingdom means joining the church; and establishing the kingdom means furthering the interests of the church. Much has been lost through this confusion of terms and conceptions that should be clearly distinguished.

What then is the Christian church? And what is her relation to the kingdom of God?

I

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH ACCORDING TO HER OWN CLAIMS.

To form a true conception of the Christian church and of her real mission we must first of all dispossess our minds of much that she has said about herself. The church has not been a good example of that spirit of meekness which Jesus said was to be characteristic of his followers. On the contrary, she has been inclined to exalt herself. No sooner did she come into possession of great wealth and power than she began to develop a very pronounced self-consciousness and to make very pretentious

claims for herself. Because of what the church has said about herself many credulous people have inferred that she is a sort of Fourth Person in the God-head.

Quite early in her history the Christian church began to claim an absolute monopoly of the grace and favor of God. She denied that salvation could be found anywhere outside of her bounds, or in any other way than through the ministrations of her duly ordained ministry. It is true that this claim had a basis in fact. For several centuries it was literally true that there was no Christian nurture outside of the Christian church. The Christian traditions were found only in the church. The Christian spirit was found only among the organized groups of Christians. The Christian church of the first few centuries was the only organization that made an effort to incarnate the principles of the kingdom of God. Everything in pagan society was opposed to the unselfish ideals and purposes of the kingdom. During these fateful years the Christian church was like a hothouse in which the tender germs of Jesus' teachings were preserved. Society owes her a debt of devout gratitude for this service.

But the church continued to claim a strict monopoly of salvation long after these peculiar conditions ceased to exist. Long after other agencies—science, art, literature, and philosophy—had shown more interest in the real aims of the kingdom than the church did, she still persistently denied that any good thing was found outside of her bounds. She still denied that divine grace flowed anywhere save through the finger tips of her ordained clergy. A hierarchy of middlemen claimed an airtight monopoly of the grace and favor of Almighty God. And for deception, unscrupulousness, and extravagance, these middlemen in the Roman Catholic scheme of salvation outclassed anything of the kind that we know of in our modern industrial system in which the middleman plays such a conspicuous part. The claims which the church made for her clergy were preposterous. For her ordinary priests

she claimed a spiritual primacy which their daily conduct plainly contradicted. For her chief pontiff she claimed infallibility, a prerogative which we have a right to claim only for Almighty God Himself. When the pope spoke "excathedra" he was said to reproduce the voice of God as the phonograph reproduces the voice of the singer. When he spoke in his official capacity he could make no mistake. What he thus said was both law and Gospel. In this way the head of the church was made a substitute for God instead of a servant of God. As the Catholic church grew in wealth and power she boldly usurped the place of the kingdom; and henceforth became an end to be served instead of a means of service. She claimed to hold in her hands the keys to heaven and hell. These dread keys she was constantly using in the interest of her own ends and purposes. These claims implied nothing less than that Almighty God had resigned His position on earth in favor of the pope and his institution.

The Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers eliminated the Catholic middleman as the sole mediator of salvation. It placed the clergy and the laity on an equality of privilege before God. But Protestantism, while it placed the whole membership of the church upon the same plane before God, nevertheless continued to consider the church, as an institution, as the sole mediator of divine grace and favor. Protestantism, like Catholicism, denied that divine grace was operative outside of the church. John Calvin, the theological champion of the Reformation movement, voiced the sentiment of all Protestantism when he said: "There is no other means of entering into life unless she (i. e., the church) conceive us in her womb and give us birth, unless she nourish us at her breast, and, in short, keep us under her charge and government, until, divested of mortal flesh, we become like the angels. Moreover, beyond the pale of the church there is no forgiveness of sins, and no salvation can be hoped for. . . . The paternal favor of God and the special

evidence of spiritual life are confined to his people (i. e. the church people), and hence the abandonment of the church is always fatal." [1] That is equivalent to denying that God uses any other instrument than the church in the building of His kingdom, or that He is concerned about anybody but the church people.

The orthodox Protestant church of our own day still claims for herself a supernatural origin and nature essentially different from that of any other institution on earth. She still declares herself to be the divinely commissioned ark of safety which people must enter in order to be saved from the wrath of God and from eternal doom. She still claims the custodianship of the keys that lock and unlock the doors of the eternal world. She calls herself "the mystical body of Christ," by which she implies some supernatural or magical relationship with Jesus—a relationship that differs essentially from those ethical relationships which we know and understand as human beings. She declares that she has a panacea for all ills, although there are many ills at her very doors which she has not even noticed. The church is still suffering from an abnormal imagination.

Professor Rauschenbusch says: "The fact is that the church has watered its own stock and cannot pay dividends on all the paper it has issued. It has made claims for itself to which no organization made up of human beings can live up." [2] But the day has passed when the church can make capital out of fictitious claims. No institution can afford to flood the market with paper on which it fails to pay dividend. The interests of the kingdom of God demand that the church make a voluntary sacrifice of her watered stock. It is to her own disadvantage to continue making claims for herself to which she does not and cannot live up.

[1] The Institutes, Book IV. I, 4.
[2] A Theology for the Social Gospel, p. 122.

II

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH AS DETERMINED BY THE FACTS OF HER ORIGIN

What then is the Christian church? And what is her special relation to the kingdom of God?

This question must be answered in the light of the quite natural origin of the church, and not in the light of what the church of a later day said about herself. To one who is more familiar with the claims of the church than with the facts of history it may be a shock to be told that Jesus had nothing at all to say about this great institution. While the kingdom of God absorbed his whole life and thought, the church, as we have come to know it, seems not to have concerned him at all. There are only two of all the recorded sayings of Jesus that refer to the church, and both of these are of doubtful authenticity. There is no reliable evidence that Jesus ever spoke a word in reference to the church.

This, however, does not mean that Jesus did not foresee the inevitableness of some organization to perpetuate his work. The ideals of Jesus could not have been perpetuated without embodiment in some institution. But it would have been quite unlike him to give any specific instructions as to the form, or the modus operandi, of the institution that should continue his work. Jesus revealed the ideals and the principles of the kingdom; and then entrusted the completion of the task to those who shared his convictions. With what outward forms the ideals of the kingdom would clothe themselves; by means of what institutions or organizations they would perpetuate themselves among the different peoples of the earth, and in succeeding ages, did not seem to concern Jesus. The inculcation of a new spirit was what he was concerned about. Everything else would take care of itself; for it is characteristic of living things that they will give themselves

suitable bodies. Every type of life creates suitable means to perpetuate itself. Every living thing evolves the kind of body that will best realize its peculiar genius and purpose. This is true in the animal and plant world; and it is equally true in the world of human society. The genius and spirit of an organism, whether animal or vegetable, may, in the course of its evolution, develop different forms of body, some appendages being lopped off and others being added, before that form is realized that will best serve the spirit and purpose of the organism. And it is not otherwise in the kingdom of God. The spirit and genius of the kingdom may, in the long course of history, give rise to different forms of religious institutions, to different forms of political and industrial systems, before those types will finally be evolved that will best serve the spirit and purpose of the kingdom.

Jesus, in his brief ministry, was dealing with life and with ideals, and not with organizations and institutions. But life in a disembodied form, as was just stated, is inconceivable. Ideals without incorporation in institutions will perish. It was this plain biological law, and not something that Jesus said or that the Spirit did, that gave birth to the Christian church. Moved by loyalty to their beloved Master, and inspired by his promises, the disciples set themselves to the task of perpetuating his influence among men. Their labors were very simple at first. There was neither plan nor leadership in their efforts. But such a state of affairs could not continue long; for where there is life there will be organization. Within a year or two the evangelistic efforts of the disciples resulted in a simple organization. This was as natural as it is for the living seed to put forth stem and leaves. This simple Apostolic organization was the beginning of the Christian church. The organization was not formed in compliance with any instructions that had previously been given, but under the constraint of a biological necessity. The Christian church was purely the result of circumstances.

The primitive organization consisted of a body of men and women held together and controlled by a common faith, a common loyalty, and a common purpose. There was a very simple division of labor, some being set apart as preachers and teachers, while others were entrusted with the more material and practical interests of the new community. The purpose of the organization was to realize within their own group the spirit and the ideals of Jesus, and to extend his influence in ever widening circles over the earth.

It is clear from the simple facts of the origin of the Christian church that she is not an end in herself, but a means for the realizing of the principles and ideals of Jesus. She is an instrument for the establishing of the kingdom of God on earth. She is this, and only this. Any attempt to exalt her above this can only result in degrading her into something less than she is. Her origin was not any more supernatural than the origin of our public schools. She is just as much a man-made institution as is the organization that serves the purpose of education. Her constituency and her machinery are as human as the constituency and the machinery of the schools. It is in this light that we must judge her quite evident shortcomings. The only divine distinction that the church can truly claim for herself is the divine purpose of establishing the kingdom of God. When she ceases to serve the interests of the kingdom she forfeits not only her claim to divine distinction, but even her right to exist.

But in the degree that the church is true to her divinely entrusted task of establishing the kingdom she may well claim a unique place among all the institutions of society; for there is no other task so great and so holy as this one. This social task to which the church stands committed by virtue of her origin, furnishes the basis for a revaluation of her mission in our modern life. If she will consecrate her marvellous resources in men, in machinery, and in traditions, to this holy cause, she will render a service

which no other institution is able to render. The kingdom of God, or the brotherhood-world, cannot be established by unorganized individual efforts, or by independent group efforts. It can be done only as many individuals who cherish its ideals will coördinate their efforts in and through some institution. Individuals become real factors in the establishing of the kingdom of God only as they unite their efforts with other individuals in and through an institution that is dedicated to the cause of the kingdom. Some great and mighty institution, whether it will be a kingdom-filled church, or some other kingdom-filled institution, is an indispensable necessity in the difficult task of Christianizing the social order. It is my faith in the church's latent power as a factor in social regeneration, a power which no other institution possesses at the present time, that makes me zealous for her conversion to the social point of view of the kingdom of God.

As an instrument of the kingdom of God it is the duty of the Christian church to render every service and to encourage every effort that will advance the progress of righteousness. In the remaining chapters there are references to many specific kinds of service which the church should render in the interest of the kingdom. But there are two outstanding duties of the Christian church that require special emphasis at this point. As the logical successor of the synagogue which was the place of instruction, and of the temple which was the place of worship, the church has fallen heir to the two-fold responsibility of leadership in religious education and of leadership in divine worship. These two fundamental duties must be well performed before her other duties can be effectively executed. It is through these two fundamental disciplines that the church must help to lay the foundations for the superstructure of a righteous and lasting social order.

III

THE CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The most important duty of the Christian church is that of leadership in religious education. No other function is so far-reaching in its total effects as this one. It is in this capacity that the church has an opportunity to exert a vital influence on every department of the world's life. It is as a teacher of religion that she is the good house-wife of the Parable who puts the regenerating leaven into the mass of social dough. It is as a teacher of religion that she sets up the standards and the ideals after which we must strive in our efforts to build a better world. It is as a teacher of religion that she creates the public sentiment and the social conscience that will result in constructive efforts for social betterment. The educational institutions of the church are the primal agencies of religious education; and the pulpit, the Sunday school, the home, schools for week-day religious instruction, classes for preparation in church membership, classes for the application of Christian principles to our social life, the church papers, books, pamphlets, etc., are the channels through which the Christian message must find its way into our individual and our social life.

Three things are imperatively necessary if the church would meet the obligations that rest upon her as religious educator in the twentieth century. *She must teach the religion of the kingdom of God and not a religion of her own making; and she must adapt her teaching to the intellectual world and to the social world of to-day.*

The Church Must Teach the Religion of the Kingdom of God.—That there has been a departure from the simple, human religion of the kingdom of God as it was preached and practiced by the prophets and by Jesus is a plain fact of history; and to this fact, more than to any other factor, must be attributed the social inefficiency that

has been charged against historical Christianity. It is very necessary, in the interest of a system of religious education that shall meet the demands of our day, that we see in what way and to what extent our Christian theology has departed from the ideals and motives of our Master. The first step in the revival of a religious education that will be a vital factor in the establishing of the kingdom of God is the unlearning of a mass of traditions and practices that have been perpetuated as Christian, but which are not Christian in the sense that they are not rooted in any thing that Jesus was or said or did. The thing that concerns us especially in this discussion is the fact that the non-Christian accretions in our theology have side-tracked the social ideals of the kingdom of God, and have been destructive of the social passion which those ideals generate.

(a). *The theological departure from the doctrine of the kingdom of God.* . . . The departure from the kingdom-idea as the controlling motive of our religious life began with the first generation of Christians. There is a sudden change of terminology and of view-point as we pass from the Synoptic Gospels to the Gospel according to St. John. In the Fourth Gospel the term: eternal *life,* which is an individual idea, takes the place of the Synoptic term: *kingdom of God* or *kingdom of heaven,* which is a social idea. The Fourth Gospel reflects the conception of a later generation. It is an interpretation rather than a record of the Master's teachings.

The change of viewpoint and of motive is still more marked as we pass from the Gospels to the Epistles. The central theme of Jesus' preaching was the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of heaven. This one subject absorbed his whole life and thought. But in the Epistles we find the idea of the kingdom to have passed from the center to the circumference. Not only does the term kingdom of God rarely occur in the Epistles as compared with the Synoptic Gospels, but when it does occur it denotes some-

thing essentially different from the social conception of the prophets and the ethical idealism of Jesus.

It has been pointed out by certain historians that the Roman government's watchful suspicion of all appearances of treason prevented the early Christians from speaking freely about the kingdom of God, or of Jesus as the Founder of the kingdom. The mere use of the terms king and kingdom might have incriminated the Apostles in a Roman court. But there were other factors than this fear of the Roman government that forced the kingdom-idea from the center to the circumference of Apostolic thought. With the Apostles the person of Jesus displaced the idea of the kingdom which he came to establish. Jesus preached the kingdom of God, and the Apostles preached Jesus. This was quite natural, for loyalty to a person like Jesus is much easier than loyalty to an idea like the kingdom of God. But the thing that concerns us especially in this discussion is the fact that it was not Jesus the Founder of the kingdom of God whom they preached and to whom they were loyal, but Jesus the Supernatural Savior. Instead of salvation *for* a sinful world, the Apostles preached salvation *from* a sinful world. It was this Apostolic emphasis of Jesus as the Supernatural Savior from sin, instead of Jesus the Founder of the kingdom of God, that started the Christian church on her long theological journey away from the social ideals and purposes which center about the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God. The displacement of Jesus the Founder of the kingodm of God by Jesus the Supernatural Savior has meant an incalculable social loss to the church and the world. The speedy return of Jesus to destroy the existing social order became of more absorbing interest to the first generation of Christians than his first coming to save it. The kingdom of God was accordingly thought of as a super-earthly state that would be established suddenly and miraculously when the Son of Man would come in his glory. Practically all of the

references to the kingdom in the Epistles emphasize this eschatological aspect of it.

But the primal factor in the displacement not only of the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God, but of Jesus himself, was the Apostle Paul.[1] That noble soul saved Christianity from a premature death through his heroic efforts to win its independence from Judaism. Had Paul not won in the controversy with the Judaizing Christians, Christianity would very likely have lingered on for a while as a Jewish sect, and would then have died out. But for the Christianity which he so heroically saved from an early grave, he unconsciously substituted his own interpretation; and the church has accepted the Pauline interpretation in place of the original religion of Jesus.

It was, in the first place, the great misfortune of St. Paul never to have known Jesus personally. Whatever facts he knew about his Lord he had obtained through secondary sources. For reasons that are well known, Paul purposely dissociated himself from the men who were eye and ear witnesses of the life and teachings of the Master. He had been converted for a number of years before he had a personal interview with any of the men who were personally acquainted with Jesus. We have no doubt that the loyal Paul gathered all the external facts that were known about Jesus; nor do we doubt that he understood these facts as well as any of the eye and ear witnesses did. But the significant fact remains that Gamaliel, and not Jesus, was his teacher. As a special student of Gamaliel from his youth, and as an adept in Rabbinical dialectics, he interpreted the simple facts which he had gathered in accordance with the bias of his lifelong Jewish training. His philosophical nature

[1] For a comprehensive study of this subject see: Pfleiderer, Paulinism, 2 vols, London, 1877. Also Pfleiderer, The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, N. Y., 1885. For a critical study of this problem see: Ignatius Singer, The Rival Philosophies of Jesus and Paul, London, 1919.

could not rest satisfied with the simple facts about the life and teachings of Jesus as he had received them. His dialectical instinct demanded a theory to account for the facts. His new Christian ideas had to be reconciled with certain ideas that were derived from his early home life and his later Rabbinical training. The origin of sin, the nature of salvation, the reason for the death of the Messiah, and the ground for the divine forgiveness of sin, had to be fused into a system in accordance with some organizing principles of thought. The result was a speculative system of theology which, in certain very important respects, is quite different from the simple "good news" of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as preached and practiced by the peasant prophet of Nazareth.

St. Paul constructed the cardinal doctrine of his theological system, a doctrine which has held a central place in the theologizing of nineteen centuries, out of his own extraordinary experience, and not out of anything that Jesus had ever said or intimated. The material for his doctrine of justification by faith through the grace of God without any merit of his own was furnished by his strange experience on his way to Damascus; and the sacrificial ritual of his people, rather than the teachings of Jesus, furnished the principles in accordance with which the experience was explained and elaborated. According to his own severe judgment, he was the chief of sinners. But God forgave him, and accepted him as a disciple. St. Paul's intellect demanded an explanation of the ground on which God could forgive such a sinner as he was. Jesus' explanation of the divine forgiveness of sin was very simple, and ethically very satisfying. Jesus said that God forgives men because He is their Father; and that He does so on the ground that a father forgives a child. Jesus said that God justifies men on the ground that they love Him as a child loves, and that they love one another as brothers love. But Paul does not betray the slightest

influence of Jesus in the explanation which he gives of his own experience of divine forgiveness. His God was a Sovereign law-giver rather than a Father. Paul had broken the laws of the Sovereign God. Infinite justice demanded satisfaction. But how can such a demand be satisfied? The idea of vicarious sacrifice, which held a prominent place in the ritual of his people, furnished Paul with the principle of explanation. Jesus must have offered himself as a vicarious sacrifice for sinful men; and the Sovereign God must have accepted this sacrifice as a payment or satisfaction for man's sin. Through faith in the vicarious death of Jesus Paul felt justified before the Sovereign God without any merit of his own.

While this purely forensic idea of justification, and the purely individualistic and mechanical conception of salvation that is associated with it, may be supported by one, or perhaps two, proof-texts from the reported sayings of Jesus, it is altogether out of harmony with Jesus' fundamental doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, and with the idea of forgiveness and of justification which naturally follows from this doctrine. The fundamental difference between Jesus and Paul on this vital matter cannot be explained away. Jesus' doctrine is ethical and social, while Paul's doctrine is mechanical and individualistic. The former doctrine relates itself directly to the building of the kingdom of God, while the latter does not. No one can take Jesus' doctrine seriously and not feel constrained to make constructive efforts to build a better world; but a man may take Paul's doctrine seriously and rest content with the sweet peace of mind that his sins are forgiven for Jesus' sake, and that his heavenly reward is sure. The two doctrines have an altogether different influence on the membership of the church and on the citizenship of the community.

While the idea of the kingdom of God as a social order regenerated by brotherly love is not absent from the mind of Paul, it does not occupy the central place in his system

that it did in the teachings of Jesus.[1] It is side-tracked while a speculative theology highly colored by Rabbinism, occupies the main track. St. Paul is in perfect agreement with Jesus in most respects, but he is not in agreement with him in the matter that was most fundamental in Jesus and that should have remained most fundamental in Christianity. It is a regrettable thing that the speculative Paul trained in Rabbinical dialectics, rather than the practical Jesus trained in the school of life, became the guide for all subsequent theologizing.

Another potent factor in the displacement of Jesus and of the doctrine of the kingdom of God as a social order regenerated by brotherly love, was the subtle influence of Greek philosophy.[2] The great minds that moulded the theology of the church after the Apostolic Age were, almost without exception, men who were profoundly influenced by the conceptions and methods of Greek philosophy. Their conversion to Christianity, more especially since most of them were converted rather late in life—after their education was completed and their mental habits more or less fixed—could not uproot all their philosophical preconceptions, nor destroy their inborn love of dialectics. Many of the venerable church fathers were more Greek and less Christian than either they themselves or many of their biographers have imagined. Christian exegesis became largely a matter of dialectics in their hands. In Alexandria the Old Testament Scriptures had been recast under the influence of a religious Platonism

[1] In all his writings St. Paul refers to the kingdom of God only thirteen times, while in the few recorded sayings of Jesus there are no less than one hundred and eleven distinct references to the subject.

[2] I wish to take this opportunity to express my indebtedness to Professor William Romaine Newbold, of the University of Pennsylvania, one of the foremost authorities on the later Greek philosophy, who was the first one to impress me with the extent to which Greek philosophy influenced Christian thought and practice.

before Jesus was born. And the New Testament did not escape this same influence. There is unmistakable evidence of Alexandrian influence in the Fourth Gospel. The plain prophet from Nazareth of Galilee was identified with the pre-existent Logos of the Alexandrian philosophy. And the Alexandrian Logos doctrine was the grand-child of the older Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of Ideas. In this way a purely Greek idea helped to displace Jesus the Founder of the kingdom of God by Jesus the pre-existent Savior.

A thing that is worthy of special note is the fact that Paul, and not Jesus, furnished the material for the theologizing of the church fathers. The element in the New Testament that appealed least to the majority of the church fathers was the simple, ethical Gospel of Jesus. The Galilean prophet's "good news" of the Fatherhood of God, and of the brotherhood world that is to follow from the fact of the divine Fatherhood, exerted little influence on the dogmatizing of the philosophically inclined church fathers. But in the Epistles of Paul they found a rich mine to which to devote their dialectical skill. As the simple facts about Jesus were fused by St. Paul into a system in harmony with the conceptions and the terminology of the sacrificial ritual of the Jews, so the essential elements of Pauline theology were recast by the early church fathers under the influence of certain preconceptions of the later Greek philosophy. The result was a system of theology in which the prophetic doctrine of the kingdom of God had little or no place. It all happened unconsciously. In the case of the church fathers, as in the case of St. Paul, there was not the slightest thought of displacing Jesus, or the doctrine of the kingdom of God which was such a consuming passion with him. The church fathers were intensely loyal to Jesus—ready, like St. Paul, to be crucified anew with him;—but their loyalty did not prevent the submerging of the fundamental principles and ideals of Jesus beneath a mass of

SCHOOL OF THEOLOG

speculations about the mysteries of his person and his death. [1]

The influx from the East, first of Aristotelian and later of Platonic influences during the early part of the Middle Ages, left its further impress upon the theology and the practice of the church. Harnack has pointed out to what extent Neo-Platonism, as it was originally developed in Alexandria, but more especially as it was elaborated later by Plotinus in Rome, from 244-270, has affected our Christian ideas and practices. Christianity had already been affected by the pronounced ascetic and anti-social tendency in Gnosticism. And now, through Neo-Platon-

[1] For a brief statement of the social teachings of the church fathers, see: "The Social Gospel," Crown Theological Library, 1907, by Harnack and Herman...It would be possible to select an array of proof texts from the teachings of the church fathers which might class them as men who shared the social passion of Amos and Micah. Quite recently I heard an address on the social teachings of the church fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries in which they were classed among the social prophets of the ages. The sayings which the speaker quoted from the fathers, if viewed by themselves, would justify the classification. It is true that no modern soap-box, socialist orator ever expressed himself more radically on the subject of private property than some of the venerable church fathers did. But their radical attitude toward the accumulation of personal property was something essentially different from the attitude of men like Amos and Jesus. The church fathers were controlled by the ascetic or Greek conception of religion, and not by the social conception of the Hebrews and Jesus. Their attitude toward the grabbing and hoarding of goods was determined by their fear of the seductive influence of property on the individual possessor, rather than by the conception of the moral value to society of a more equitable distribution of property. They advocated the giving of one's goods to the poor, not with the idea of bringing social health and well-being to the poor recipients, but for the sake of disciplining the soul of the giver. It is a very different kind of charitableness from that which is implied in Jesus' doctrine of the universal brotherhood of man. The church fathers' conception of charity is essentially individualistic, not social. It is not the kind of benevolence that will build the kingdom of God. . . .

ism, the conception of the dualism of matter and spirit, of body and soul, and the Platonic contempt for matter as the seat of all corruption, was still further impressed upon Christianity. This conception of matter and its relation to life finds no support in anything that is truly Hebrew or Christian. The prominent place which this Greek conception has held in the theology and practice of the Christian church has been prolific in its anti-social influence in the world. It has kept the church from attempting her full duty to our physical and social life. Monachism, which, from this time on to the close of the fifteenth century, represented the very soul of the Christian religion, was the logical expression of this unchristian view of matter and spirit.

And not only was the Pauline interpretation of the Gospels rethought in conformity with certain philosophic preconceptions, but Christianity was still further modified through its long and close association with the many other religions in the Roman empire. For more than two and a half centuries Christianity, Gnosticism, Manichæism, the pagan cult of Isis, and certain other pagan cults, were contending for the mastery of the Roman empire. We are well aware that the Hebrew religion was affected by its long and close association with the religions of the Caananites and the surrounding tribes, and later through its contact with the religions of Babylon and Persia. And, in the same way and to a much greater extent than we have liked to admit, Christianity was influenced and modified through its long association and competition with the other religions in the Roman empire. I do not believe, as some historians have claimed, that Christianity purposely incorporated some of the essential elements of these religions for the purpose of making the proselyting of their devotees easier. I believe that the assimilation took place unconsciously. But whether it happened consciously or unconsciously, we know that such an assimilation took place, and that the ultimate

triumph of Christianity over all the other religions was, in some measure, due to this fact.

There is no doubt that the worship of the virgin Mary, a practice that is absolutely foreign to the Hebrew mind, was a graft from the pagan cult of Isis, which had made its advent into the empire from Egypt about the year 86 B. C. It was Christianity's adaptation of itself to the need felt by many people in the Roman empire for the recognition of the female principle in the idea of the Deity. The cult of Isis, of which the emperor Domitian was a priest, and which had held a prominent place in Roman life for two and a half centuries, disappeared from the empire soon after imperial privilege had turned the tide in favor of Christianity. The devotees of Isis found no great difficulty in accepting Christianity because they found incorporated in it certain essential features of their own religion. Gnosticism, which for a long time was a most powerful rival of Christianity, also recognized the female principle in its conception of the Deity. Some of the religions with which Chrinstianity had to compete for its existence had their doctrine of the Trinity, of a pre-existent Deliverer, and of the virgin birth of a Savior. They all had their ablutions, or baptismal washings. Some of them had their sacred meal eaten in honor of and in the mystical presence of the gods. Everything that was Platonic was animated by an intense desire for personal immortality. While some of these ideas and practices existed, in germ, in the original teachings of Jesus, there is no doubt that they were given a place of prominence in historical Christianity that would not have been given them had they not held such a prominent place in the religions with which Christianity had to compete for more than two and a half centuries.

It is a matter of quite general knowledge that some of our most cherished Christian festivals are of pagan origin. Christmas, with its many hallowed associations, occupies

a tender place in every Christian's heart. We could not afford to lose its hallowing influence on our life. But our Christian Christmas is merely an adaptation of an ancient pagan festival originally suggested by the winter solstice. The very name Easter is a "shibboleth" that betrays the pagan descent of our second great Christian festival. There is no doubt at all about this. And precisely as these festal days are a Christian assimilation and adaptation of pagan material, so also are many of those doctrines and practices which, for many centuries, have been made to represent the very soul of the Christian religion. Monasticism, asceticism, and the contempt for social life which assumed such gigantic proportions after the seventh and eighth centuries, show to what extent Gnosticism, Manichæism, and Neo-Platonism succeeded in obscuring the social ideals of Jesus and in diverting the church from her original duty of establishing the kingdom of God. These non-Christian accretions crowded the doctrine of the kingdom of God out of our Christian theology.

From the days of Constantine Christianity began to suffer a more serious degeneration from an altogether different source. This shrewd emperor was the first one to see that Christianity could not be destroyed by persecution. He was convinced that it had made its way into the empire to stay. Instead of making further efforts to destroy it, as his predecessors had done, he sought a way of making it an ally of the empire; and he succeeded in his scheme to the lasting detriment of the true Christian religion. The illegitimate union of Christianity and Roman politics, which was begun by Constantine and completed by his successors, was more detrimental to the cause of the kingdom of God than the combined influence of Greek philosophy and the pagan cults. The state favors which Christianity now received at once established its mastery over its former rivals. After the fourth century the church began to receive vast grants of land

and large sums of money. In quick succession the church stepped from the dark caves of persecution into the limelight of imperial favor. And the thing affected her precisely as the sudden promotion from poverty and wretchedness to a position of wealth and honor affects some individuals. She lost first her head, and then her heart. In a short time the church, which had been called into existence for the purpose of extending the kingdom of brotherhood over all the earth, became the ally of the most corrupt and despotic state of all history. Instead of championing the cause of brotherhood and justice she now became an apologist for the despotism and the corruption that had entrenched themselves in her political benefactor. Freed from her former poverty and exercising the complete mastery of the religious situation in the empire, the Christian church forgot her holy mission. She now substituted herself for the kingdom of God. She henceforth became an end to be served, instead of a means of service. She developed a set of ecclesiastical machinery and elaborated a ritualistic program in comparison with which the priestly program of the Jewish church in its palmiest days looked cheap. By means of the fiction of papal infallibility she placed her own teaching on an equality with that of Jesus himself. This was the final step in the gradual displacement of Jesus and his doctrine of the kingdom of God from the theology and the practice of the Christian church.

By the end of the eighth century there was but little left of the principles and ideals of Jesus in the theology and the practice of the church. Jesus himself would not have recognized the majority of the doctrines and practices that bore his name. Rauschenbusch says: "Imagine Jesus, with the dust of Galilee on his sandals, coming into the church of St. Sophia in Constantinople in the fifth century, listening to the dizzy doctrinal definitions about the relation of the divine and the human in his nature, watching priests performing gorgeous acts of wor-

ship, reciting long and set prayers, and offering his own mystical body as a renewed sacrifice to their God!" [1] Was there ever another teacher whose principles and motives were so distorted and caricatured by his friends?

As religious educator the Catholic church was merely the custodian of this mass of doctrines and traditions, and of these priest-made plans of salvation, in which the ideals and the motives of the kingdom of God had little or no place. Religious education was merely the handing down from one generation to another of this mass of fixed opinions and practices many of which were altogether foreign to the mind and spirit of Jesus, and which the people had to believe without the right to question or investigate for themselves. The indoctrinating of the people in the traditions and practices of the church, and the creating of a loyal attitude toward the priests and their system, is the fundamental aim and purpose of Catholic religious education even to-day. Neither in content, spirit, purpose, nor method, is it the kind of religious education that will inspire and qualify men for the establishing of the kingdom of God.

Before there can be any real revival in religious education we must clear the archives of much that has been passed on to us as Christian, but which is not Christian either in content or in spirit. So long as it is made the business of religious education to perpetuate non-Christian and anti-social doctrines and practices it may be a hindrance rather than a help in the establishing of the kingdom of God. Our theology must be rescued from the non-Christian elements in it before it will become a vital factor in the building of the kingdom of God. In the interest of a type of religious education that will fit men to do their duty in the matter of social regeneration, we must return to the spirit and the substance of the simple, human Gospel of the kingdom of God.

[1] Christianity and the Social Crisis, p. 94.

(b). *The return to the doctrine of the kingdom of God in Christian theology.*—Three historical movements have been slowly forcing the Christian church back to the fountain source from which she had wandered far. The first of these efforts to recover Christianity in its original purity was the Reformation of the sixteenth century. But the Protestant Reformation, while it freed Christian theology of many of the non-Christian accretions of Catholicism, did not recover the doctrine of the kingdom of God. The Reformation did not find its way back to Jesus. Neither Luther nor Calvin, the two dominating personalities of the Reformation movement, got beyond Augustine and Paul in their quest for the true Christian religion. Luther, like Paul, constructed his theological system out of his own personal experience. Luther was seeking peace of mind, which Catholic legalism failed to give him. But what faith in the Catholic church could not give him, he finally found through faith in Jesus Christ as his personal Savior. His fundamental doctrine of justification by faith alone was grounded in his own personal experience. The doctrine was fortified and elaborated, not by what Jesus said, but by what Paul said, who himself had a very similar experience. But neither Paul's nor Luther's experience was a normal religious experience. The thing, however, that concerns us especially in this discussion is the fact that the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith alone, like the Pauline doctrine of justification by divine grace without any human merit, will, if consistently carried out, develop a very different kind of Christian individual from the one developed by Jesus' vital doctrine of justification by duty to our neighbor. The Lutheran and Pauline doctrines nurture a passive type of piety, while Jesus' doctrine nurtures an active piety. The fact that Paul and Luther were both very active and aggressive men was due to their native disposition and to the pecul-

iar conditions under which they lived, and not to the fundamental precepts of their theology.

The monumental work of John Calvin was an intellectual effort to reconcile the new spirit of individualism, which for a century or more had been struggling for expression in Europe and which could no longer be suppressed, with the inherited idea of divine sovereignty as it had been developed under the old political system of monarchy and autocracy. An old type sovereign God and a new type democratic individual seem, to me, to be the foci of the Calvinistic system of theology. The system revolves around these two irreconcilable principles, while the world of Jesus revolves around the one controlling thought of the divine Fatherhood. Calvin's doctrine of predestination is unthinkable in connection with Jesus' "good news" of the universal Fatherhood of God. No theologian who would have taken Jesus and the prophets instead of Paul and Augustine as his guides, and Jesus' conception of the divine Fatherhood instead of the mediæval idea of divine sovereignty as his norm, could have written the Institutes of John Calvin. Calvin's social service in Geneva was in spite of his theology, rather than because of it. The sixteenth century Reformation was an ecclesiastical reformation with little thought of social reformation.

The Anabaptists have seldom been mentioned apart from the purpose of criticism and obloquy. But they were the only Reformation party that seemed to realize that the spirit and teachings of Jesus implied social reconstruction as well as ecclesiastical reconstruction. They may have been wrong as to the particular type of social order which they thought was implied in the principles of Jesus, and which they attempted to realize. But, be that as it may, they were the only party that realized that a radical reconstruction of the social order was as much a part of the kingdom-program as the radical reconstruction of the church. There were some fanatics

among them no doubt. Great ideals have a tendency to make fanatics. There may have been revolutionists among them who advocated the use of the sword, just as there have always been extremists who would usher in new eras by means of physical force. And it is not unlikely that there were some lewd and immoral fellows among them. But the same charge of immorality that was made against the Anabaptists has been made against every other class of people who have mingled with each other in a specially close and fraternal way. The same charge of sexual immorality was made against the early Christians in the Roman empire, and against the early Methodists in England and in our own country. The fact of the matter is that the Anabaptists were persecuted and exterminated for the same reason that Jesus was crucified. They were persecuted and finally wiped out because they preached and practiced a Gospel that would have disrupted the old corrupt social order if they had been left to go on unmolested.

The sixteenth century Protestant theology was a reconstruction of Catholic theology under the constraining impulse of the new spirit of individualism. But Paul and Augustine, and not Jesus of Nazareth, served as guides in the process of reconstruction. Many of the Catholic traditions and practices were eliminated, but the doctrine of the kingdom of God was not recovered. In time, the different branches of Protestantism summed up their particular views in certain articles of Faith, or Confession, which became authoritative for their followers down to our own day. Protestant religious education has not differed very radically either in substance, spirit, purpose, or method, from Catholic education. It has consisted essentially of information in regard to the tenets and practices of particular denominations and sects, and of information in the Scriptures from a particular sectarian angle. The aim and purpose of our Protestant religious education is still very largely the perpetuating of a par-

ticular view of the Scriptures and the creating of a loyal attitude toward the denomination, rather than the creating of the Christian attitude toward life. Religious education must be delivered from its long bondage to sectarianism before it will become a vital factor in the building of the kingdom of God.

The second movement that rendered pioneer service in swinging the church back to the position that gave her birth was the historico-critical spirit in theology, which began with Schleiermacher's *Rèden uber die religion,* and his *Glaubenslehre.* The scientific spirit in theology has accomplished at least two things.

In the first place, it has taken us back to the Scriptural sources. It has delivered us from our long enslavement to the theology of the church fathers and the reformers. It has unbarred the doors to the Holy of Holies, and has given us the courage to investigate for ourselves. It has applied to the Scriptures the same historical method with which we study other literature. It has made a scientific study of the authors of the Scriptures and of the times in which they lived. It has analyzed the religious, the historical, and the psychological forces that moulded them and that gave occasion for and significance to their message. The critical study has made it clear that the authors of the Scriptures were human beings like ourselves; and that the Scriptures are the interpretation of their experience of God and of life. It has shown the Scriptures to be a mass of individual and social experiences and opinions, of traditions and customs, which have come down to us from many different sources and covering many centuries of time.

In the second place, the critical method of exegesis has shown us that distinctly different strata run through the Scriptures such as the Prophetic, the Lelgaistic and the Priestly in the Old Testament; the Synoptic and the Johannine elements in the Gospels; and the Pauline and the General Epistles. It has convinced us that the au-

thors of the Scriptures were not all equally inspired, and that the different portions of the Scriptures are therefore not all equally valuable for edification or equally important for doctrine. The different strata which run through the Scriptures are not all of the same moral and religious excellence. In other words, the critical method of study has broken the evil spell which the fictitious doctrine of the verbal and infallible inspiration of all the Scriptures had cast over the church for many centuries. This doctrine, when taken seriously, makes faith in the swimming of Elisha's ax, or in the sun's obedience to the command of Joshua, as important as faith in the social ideals of the Sermon on the Mount. It places the Song of Solomon on the same moral plane as the book of Amos. It values proof-texts from Hebrews and Revelation as highly as Micah's precept that we do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly before our God. For many centuries the doctrine of the infallible inspiration of all the Scriptures kept the church from seeing that there is any difference between the theology of Paul and the religion of Jesus. The critical spirit has rendered invaluable service by encouraging us to make an ethical rather than a mechanical selection of Scriptural material as the basis of our theologizing. It has helped us to see that some elements in the Old Testament are more Christian than some in the New Testament.

By breaking away from the theology of the church fathers and the reformers and leading us back to the Scriptural sources; and by proving the ethical superiority of certain portions of the Scriptures over others, the critical theology has helped to clear the ground for the rediscovery of the doctrine of the kingdom of God. It is in the manuals of the critical theology that we for the first time find the subject matter so arranged as to make the idea of the kingdom of God the governing principle. In the voluminous works of the old theology the kingdom of God received but scant recognition, usually in connec-

tion with the lengthy discussions on eschatology. There is no connection between the old theological conception of the kingdom of God and the doctrine of personal salvation. The thought that the salvation of the individual is wrapped up in the salvation of society, or in the coming of the kingdom of God, we find for the first time in the theological manuals of the critical theology.

However the critical spirit which was manifested in theology since the appearance of Schleiermacher's epoch-making works in 1834, remained too academic to exert a wide influence. It captured only a few choice minds here and there in the church. It did not seriously disturb the laity in the church. It was a movement of the learned. The few critical theological manuals which made the kingdom of God the governing idea were, as a rule, written in such academic style and terminology as to make them incomprehensible to the average reader. The critical spirit did not become a popular movement such as is necessary to force so great and so conservative a body as the Christian church out of its conventional rut.

We are at this moment witnessing the third historical movement that is forcing the church back to Jesus Christ and his passion for the kingdom of God. It is the new social spirit that is struggling everywhere for expression. As the individualism, which broke up the Mediæval social order, had its origin outside of the church but found its way into the church, so this new social spirit, which is shaking the present social order to its very foundations, had its origin outside of the church but is finding its way into the church. Nothing since the days of the Protestant Reformation has so profoundly affected the world and the church as the social awakening of the last two decades. It is not confined to the study rooms of a few professors, as the critical spirit was; but is profoundly affecting everybody in the church and everybody outside of the church. It is a great popular movement, perhaps

not fully conscious of its purpose and goal, but at heart a moral movement—a feeling after brotherhood and justice. At a time like this the church must undertake the program of the kingdom of God or be stampeded by the social forces outside of her pale. Our age will turn a deaf ear to any but the social Gospel; and the only theology that will support the social Gospel is the one that is grounded in the religion of the kingdom of God. The church must teach the religion of the kingdom of God or find, sooner or later, that her mission and her privilege have been taken from her and given to others who will teach the religion of the kingdom.

The fundamental purpose of a genuinely Christian religious education is to inject the principles, the ideals, and the motives of the kingdom of God into individuals, into organizations and institutions. Its purpose is to inspire in individuals and in society the truly Christian attitude toward life,—the filial attitude toward God, the fraternal attitude toward man, and the morally purposive attitude toward things. No other religious subject matter than that which is implied in the Christian conception of the kingdom of God will satisfy the unconscious soul-hunger of the age. And no other motive than the establishing of the kingdom of God can enlist men and women of the type and character who will put an adequate program of religious education into effect in our day.

Her message, in the next place, the church must deliver in the vernacular of the age. She must speak in the language and terminology of the people. She must adapt her message to the intellectual world and to the social world that have come into existence since our Protestant theology became a finished product.

The Church must adapt her Message to the Intellectual World of To-day.—Not only have a number of non-Christian elements become incorporated with Christianity, but this mixture of Christian and non-Christian material was

fused into a finished system under the dominance of scientific and philosophic world-views which have long since been outgrown. By attempting to pass on from generation to generation a fixed system of theology, without proper regard for the progress that was made in the other departments of life, the church has been sacrificing that mental point of contact with her constituency which is so essential to successful teaching. She made the mistake of attempting to perpetuate a static system of thought in a dynamic world.

With Copernicus in science, and with Bruno in philosophy, a new intellectual world was born which is quite different, in spirit and in content, from the intellectual world of the old Ptolemaic order. The heliocentric theory of the universe gradually displaced the old geocentric theory. A new conception of space revolutionized thought. The experimental work of Darwin, LaPlace, DeVries, Spencer, Huxley, and a host of others, completely demolished the old intellectual world-order under which the church's theology became fixed and sealed against future change. Zoölogy, botany, chemistry, and biology, especially biology, have rewritten the world's history since the last authoritative Confession of the church was put upon the theological market. The hypotheses of these pioneers in science and philosophy have been verified, so far as present practical purposes are concerned, by the telescope, the microscope, and the test-tube. The new intellectual conception of the universe, and the new theories of growth and development, have found their way not only into the university and the college, but into the high school, and down to the plain man in the shop and on the street. The doctrine of evolution, or the idea of the progressive unfolding of the world's life according to calculable laws and principles, has become almost an axiom with the men who are shaping the world's intellectual life.

But while these epoch-making changes were going on

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

in the world's intellectual life, the church, for the most part, remained stationary. The Catholic church steadfastly opposed the new science and the new philosophy. The Catholic church refused to adjust herself by one jot or tittle to the revolutionary changes that were being wrought. When the foundations of the old intellectual order began to totter, she defended her static position on the ground of the infallibility of the Scriptures, which were supposed to support the old order and which were considered the final authority in matters of astronomy and geology no less than in matters of religion. "Are not the holy Scriptures infallibly inspired?" asked the church. "And do not the Scriptures tell us that God made the universe in six days, and that the sun moves, and that the earth stands still? Who will dare to match the views of Copernicus or Bruno against the infallible utterances of the Scriptures?" But the scientists and the philosophers, inspired by a sense of the truth, kept on promulgating the new views. As a last resort the church used the weapons of intimidation, anathema, excommunication, and in some cases even torture and murder. The Catholic church closed her doors against the men whose progressive views failed to square with her static theology.

The Protestant church, whose theology was cast in the thought-moulds of the old cosmological order, was very slow, in some sections quite reluctant, to recast her theological conceptions in the new thought-moulds that came into common use during the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries. When Darwin popularized the doctrine of evolution only certain progressive elements here and there in the Protestant church were ready to give it a fair hearing. The great majority of Protestants as well as Catholics considered the doctrine a contradiction of the Scriptural view of creation and development. On this ground the doctrine was opposed by the majority of churchmen, both Protestant and Catholic. In the pre-

face to his famous essay on Automatism, Huxley refers sarcastically to "the monotonous drum-beats of the heresy hunters." He mentions the Presbyterians as being especially aggressive in the campaign against the heretical innovations of the new science.

But the church, in her uncompromising attitude, was unmindful of the fact that the Scriptures, which she was defending against the heresies of the new science, were themselves an adaptation of religious faith to a philosophical world-view. The pious author of Genesis read his ideas of God and of creation into the crude cosmological conceptions of his age. Jesus poured his religious convictions into the prevailing thought-moulds of his day. St. Paul built his theological system squarely upon the Rabbinical world-view of his time. And, similarly, the Confessional Statements of the Reformation period were all made in conformity with the cosmological presuppositions of the Ptolemaic world-view which, in some respects, differed radically from the crude views of Genesis, and also from the views of the Rabbinical school of St. Paul's time. The church was honest when she took the field against the new science. She was as sincere as Paul was when he attempted to serve the interests of true religion by wiping out the new heresy of Jesus of Nazareth. The church was sincere in her belief that the demolition of the old cosmological conceptions involved the destruction of religion itself. But honesty will not atone for a lack of historical orientation and progressiveness. In spite of her vehement protests the world kept right on accepting the new views. The church's efforts to check the spread of the new science were as fruitless as the efforts of a certain lady of fiction who attempted to sweep back the tides of the Atlantic Ocean with her broom.

The conflict between the church and the pioneers of the new science was detrimental to both sides of the question. On the one hand, it resulted in the loss to the church

of the men who have been most influential in the intellectual life of the modern world. The men who were the real leaders in the intellectual progress of the last three or four centuries were, for the most part, found outside of the church. They were given the choice between denying their intellectual convictions or leaving the church; and, being honest men, they took the latter course. This fact is to be lamented all the more because the break between the church and the scientists could have been avoided if the theologians had been imbued with the historical spirit and with the tolerance which usually accompanies that spirit. The pioneers of the new science did not want to leave the church. They were forced out. Copernicus did not publish his works for twelve years for fear of offending the church. Bruno, who was more bold, paid the price of his life for his rashness. A host of others suffered reproach and social martrydom for their scientific and philosophic convictions.

On the other hand, science and philosophy suffered because of their divorce from religion. Because of this rupture, science and philosophy pursued their course without the constraining and leavening influence of religion. This is at least one reason for the materialistic and the atheistic tendency in our modern science and philosophy. There is no God in the prevailing scientific and philosophic world-views—no God but blind motion, or blind energy, or unconscious creativity—because there was no one to fill the new world-views, as they were in the process of formation, with the idea of an imminently creative and a morally purposive God.

The days of open warfare between the church and science are over. The church no longer has the power nor the desire to burn at the stake the honest seeker after truth, whose conclusions may happen to differ from her own. But that mutual trust and respect, and that spirit of coöperation, that should exist between these two great agencies, are still lacking. The church is still tacitly,

if not openly, discouraging the free spirit of investigation which is so characteristic of the modern university in general, and of the laboratory in particular. A man in the church must still fear to express his honest convictions on many subjects—convictions that have come after the most honest and conscientious study. In the degree that the church discourages free investigation in the interest of truth, she holds herself aloof from the intellectual spirit that is most characteristic of the modern world. Many of our theological seminaries are still committed to the theology that was finished and sealed under the dominance and control of the scientific presuppositions which modern men have outgrown. Some whole denominations still live in the theological world of the sixteenth century. In the public school room a text book becomes old after a few seasons of use, and in many cases antiquated in ten years; while in our catechetical classes we are still using text books that were written three hundred and fifty years ago when the conceptions and ideals with which we must inspire our age were unrecognized. These ancient books are still recognized as standard Confessions for the church. In some cases they have become invested with the sanctity of infallibility, thus forcing the use of them upon us long after their usefulness has ended. Great as these catechisms are, judged by the religious and intellectual standards of the age that produced them, and precious as they are today as historical heritages, it is a pedagogic crime to continue using them as authoritative text books for religious instruction. They do not meet the requirements of our age. The church cannot meet her obligations as religious educator by the use of confessional standards which are altogether out of gear with the intellectual spirit and machinery of our modern life.

In this way the church has been losing her point of contact with the intellectual life of the age. We have been sacrificing the interest of the men and the women who are trained in the philosophic and scientific methods

of study. The men who are animated by the free investigative spirit, which is so characteristic of the modern university, chafe under the dogmatic spirit of the church. In the university our investigation of any matter is encouraged, and our contribution to the subject, if we have the ability to make any, is welcomed with delight. But in the church everything is fixed and settled for us. We have no choice but to accept it, or place ourselves under suspicion. We are educating many of our brightest young people away from the church each year. They go away from our homes without ever having questioned the teachings of the Sunday school or the catechetical class. They never analyzed the contents of their religious faith. They accepted what somebody told them to accept. But in the university they are encouraged to investigate everything, and to place a question mark after many things. They are taught to analyze their psychological experience, and to weigh the evidence for their minds or souls. After four years spent in the schools they come back to us with a changed attitude toward the things which once they were taught to accept without question. We may censure the schools for wandering too far afield in their free investigation of everything from the nature and behavior of electrons to the nature and behavior of the individual soul and of Almighty God Himself. We may try to save the situation by persuading our boys and girls to go to their respective church schools where it may happen that neither their religious faith nor their intellectual life is seriously affected. But the fundamental difficulty involved in the misunderstanding between religion and science will not be remedied by censuring science, or by renewed efforts to educate our youths behind closed denominational fences. The issues involved in the long conflict between religion and science will not be concluded satisfactorily until both science and religion will learn to understand their respective functions, and to respect each other's respective fields.

There is no need for any fundamental antagonism between religion and science, between the university and the church. There is no excuse for an irreligious science, or for an unscientific theology. The fundamental business of science is to investigate the phenomena of nature and of life for the purpose of a practical understanding of them. The fundamental business of religion is to inspire individuals and society with a moral attitude toward the facts of nature and the problems of life for the purpose of realizing the highest individual and social ends. Between these two fundamental disciplines there is no contradiction and no occasion for antagonism. When religion attempts to deal with cosmological speculations, it leaves its distinct field and surrenders its real function. When science scorns, or dogmatically denies, the fundamental assumptions which religion makes in the interest of the highest moral and social ends it too leaves its distinct field and surrenders its real function. We must delegate to science and philosophy the investigation and explanation of natural, social, and mental phenomena, so far as they can be determined by calculable laws and principles. But we must look to religion to invest these phenomena with moral significance, and to relate them to moral and social ends and purposes. It is the function of science to determine our intellectual world-view; but it is the business of religion to fill whatever world-view we may accept for the time being with the moral purposiveness of the God of Jesus Christ. World-views and theories of becoming are not fixed notions, sealed against all future change, as our theological notions have been. They are, at best, only relative and tentative. They are only modes of explanation. Later discoveries may disprove what we now hold to be almost axiomatic. Historical study has made it clear that the world-views, under which our theology shaped itself into a finished system, changed several times. Some future world-view may differ radically from the one which is now dominating

the minds of men. It is in the nature of progress to expect that it will be so.

But amid all these changes the unchanging purpose of religion is to fill with the moral purposiveness of the God of Jesus Christ the particular world-view that has captured the thought of mankind. The welfare of individuals and of society demands this. It really does not matter, from a moral point of view, whether we believe that God made the world by a single creative fiat or by a slow process of evolution, so long as we believe that a good God is creatively active in the world. It does not matter, from a moral point of view, whether we believe that God made the world in six ordinary days or in six million years, so long as we believe that God is in the world, working in and through natural, moral, and social agencies for the accomplishment of such ends as are implied in the doctrine of the kingdom of God. In this sense there is no reason for any misunderstanding or mistrust between science and religion, between the church and the university. The church can declare the fundamental principles of the kingdom of God in harmony with the accepted intellectual conceptions of the age. What she cannot do is to perpetuate the cosmology of Genesis, or of the sixteenth century, in the twentieth century. And it is not the business of religious education to do that.

The Church Must Adapt Her Message to the Social World of Today.—Not only has a new intellectual world come into existence since our theology became a finished product, but also a new social world, which is placing new responsibilities upon the church. In the age when our religious conceptions assumed their present form, social relationships were few and simple. When the great Confessions which are still the standards of faith for the church were written, 90% of all the people in every Protestant community in the world lived in the open country,

where each family was practically a world unto itself. But as great a change has taken place in the social world as that which we just noticed in the intellectual world. The discovery of mechanical power, the invention of labor saving machinery, and other economic and social factors, have caused a rapid flux of the population from the country into the cities and towns. To-day 51.9% of the people of the United States live in communities of upwards of 2,500 people, while 25% of our people live in the cities of upwards of 100,000 inhabitants. Division of labor has been carried to the point where multitudes of people from the remotest sections of the earth contribute to the needs of each family's everyday life. Our social life has become a matter of multitudinous relationships and of a complicated interdependence.

The following clipping from the Oklahoma State Register shows to what extent our everyday life, even in the remotest country districts, has become related to and dependent upon people who are far removed from us in distance. "The average Oklahoma farmer gets up at the alarm of a Connecticut clock; buttons his Chicago suspenders to his Detroit overalls; washes his face with Cincinnati soap in a Pennsylvania pan; sits down to a Grand Rapids table; eats Chicago meat and Minnesota flour, cooked with Texas cottolene, on a Sears-Roebuck stove; puts a New York bridle upon a Missouri mule fed with California alfalfa; ploughs a farm covered with a Vermont mortgage, with an Illinois plow. When bed time comes he reads a chapter from a Bible printed in Boston, crawls under a blanket made in New Jersey, only to be kept awake by an Oklahoma dog, the only home product on the place." The article from which this clipping is taken was written for the purpose of encouraging home industry in Oklahoma; but it incidentally shows to what extent our everyday life has become linked up with the life and the labors of multitudes of people whom we do not know, but to whom we owe a brother's considera-

tion and a brother's duty. These social relationships, and this complicated interdependence of our life, create moral and religious problems which former ages, when every farmer was his own butcher, and baker, and candlestick maker, did not know.

In this new social world all the cardinal virtues not only require a wider application, but become invested with a moral significance which they did not have and could not have in the old order of fewer and simpler relationships. The common virtues of honesty, justice, truthfulness, mercy, temperance, purity, etc., become invested with a significance in this new world of multitudinous and far-reaching relationships which they did not have in the old world-order. So far as social consequences are concerned it would not matter what kind of man a Robinson Crusoe on his lonely island might be. In his heart of hearts he might be covetous, revengeful, lustful, and mean. So long as he lives alone on his island empire no young girls will be outraged by his lust, and no neighbors will be injured by his unsocial disposition. But in a world of such inescapable relationships as ours, it matters everything what kind of individuals we are. When the making of a can of adulterated pork and beans in Boston may poison a family out on the Pacific coast; and when a single vote in the Board of Directors' meeting in Wall Street, New York City, may set in motion forces that will ultimately affect 100,000,000 people all over the country, the common virtues of honesty and benevolence receive a significance which they could not have in any other age of history. A group of selfish employers bent upon perpetuating their autocratic power and their big dividends; or a group of class-conscious laborers determined to show who is boss in industry, may precipitate a conflict that will affect not only this particular group of laborers and their employers, but the citizenship of the whole country. Never before in the history of the human race was it so necessary to declare in simple, forceful

language the fundamental Christian fact that we are all brothers, and that we must treat one another as brothers, not only in the prayer-meeting, but in all our relationships and dealings with one another.

And not only has our individual life become linked up with the lives of countless other individuals, but certain social creatures have made their appearance which put an added strain upon the common virtues. Certain super-personal creatures have come into existence in the new social atmosphere which might be as much of a curiosity to the citizens of the ancient social order as the mastedons of past geological ages are to us. Our trusts and corporations with their voracious appetites for profit and dividends—an appetite that has never yet been known to be satisfied, for the more they get the hungrier they are; these strange creatures which have neither body, mind, nor will of their own, and yet exercise almost infinite power—power over their competitors and power over governments; these seemingly indestructible creatures which have frequently been dismembered, dissolved, and legally declared dead, and yet continue to do business without any visible effects of the dissolution, showing just as much power, and manifesting even a keener appetite for profit than before; these strange creatures bred in the social atmosphere of the last half century are as marvellous as any freak or monster of the land or the sea or the air of any geological age of history. The common virtues of honesty, of good will, and of fair play receive a new significance when applied to these super-personal creatures, which have neither bodies to be kicked nor souls to be damned. The greater the ability and the power of an institution,—and the less personal responsibility it bears,— the more imperatively necessary it is that we endeavor to christianize it in its inner purposes and in its outward practices.

The business of present day religious education is not only to inspire individuals with the ideals and the prin-

ciples of the kingdom of God, but also to inspire these great and powerful super-personal entities to govern themselves in conformity with these same ideals. One of the greatest needs of our age is a new type of conscience,—a conscience in individuals and in institutions that recognizes our sacred obligations and responsibilities to all other individuals, and to all groups of individuals, with whom our life and our interests are so intricately wrapped up. If the church will fail to develop this conscience she will fail in one of her paramount duties. And I fear that, up to this time, we have not met this obligation. Our theology has not been of the kind to inspire the social conscience. Our preaching, while it has been honest and sincere, has failed to make our religious conscience function adequately in our social life.

Rauschenbusch gives the striking instance of a devout Mennonite farmer, who swore a worldly oath when he was arrested by the Toronto Board of Health for leaving cow dung in his milk cans. This sinful individual was brought before his congregation and excluded from their fellowship. However, not for leaving cow dung in his milk cans, which endangered the lives of Toronto's babies; but for swearing a worldly oath. Neither this individual nor his congregation was concerned about the health of the city, which was being jeopardized by the filthy milk. The only thing that concerned the authorities of the church was that this man had taken the name of the Lord in vain. Taking the name of the Lord in vain is wrong; but there are greater wrongs than this. Not until the church will make her members feel that leaving filth in milk cans, or watering milk, which undermines the health of human beings, is a worse sin than profane swearing, the social order will not be christianized.

The case of the Mennonite farmer may be unique, but it is not exceptional. The churches of all denominations are full of people who keep their religious conscience and their business conscience in two different compartments

of their being. All our churches have their pious members who would not swear a profane oath, or play a game of cards, or attend a dance, but who will water the milk which they sell to their neighbors. All our churches have their seemingly good and honest people who would not think of watering milk, but who will not hesitate to water the stock of their corporation or monopoly, which is a greater sin than watering milk. Our churches are full of people whose religion does not enter vitally into their dealings with their fellow men—particularly not into their business dealings. The kingdom of God has been seriously obstructed by this inconsistency. And the fault may be more that of the church than of the people. The Mennonite church in Toronto was more guilty than the individual member whom she disciplined. The church has not made it a primary purpose to relate our religion to our dealings with our neighbors. Our preaching has not directly aimed at the creation of a public conscience that is as keen and as sensitive as our private conscience, and a business conscience that is as Christian as our church conscience.

How generally we have failed to relate our religion to our social life was shown by the recent report of the Commission on the War and the Religious Outlook. On the 2nd of April, 1918, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the General War Time Commission of the Churches appointed a Special Commission on the War and the Religious Outlook. The purpose of this special commission was "to consider the state of religion as revealed or affected by the war with special reference to the duty and the opportunity of the churches, and to prepare its findings for submission to the churches." In speaking of the findings of this commission, the chairman, Dr. William Adams Brown, says: "There is just one point in connection with the religion of these young men (i. e., the young men who served in the world war and whose conception of religion was studied by this commis-

sion) to which I desire to call attention, and that is this —that the great body of truths which center about the central conception of our Lord's teaching, viz., the kingdom of God, are conspicuous by their absence. I will not say (God forbid that I should say) that the ideal of unselfish social service was not present in the life of these young men, but I can say with confidence that it was not associated in their minds with that for which the church of Jesus Christ stands. Here surely is a situation which needs the earnest consideration not only of every minister, but particularly of those who are shaping the program of the church's religious education." [1] The findings of this commission furnish material for serious reflection. In the degree that the church fails to associate her message and her ministry with the ideals of unselfish service to our fellow men she fails in her first duty.

And not only has the church very generally failed to inject the kingdom-ideal of unselfish service into her individual membership, but she has failed to a still greater degree to inject this ideal of the Master into our great institutions—into our stock companies, our political parties, and the nations of the earth. Until very recently, the church made no effort to leaven our corporate life with the motives of Jesus. During the most plastic period of the new world, the church was busying herself with the old task of cultivating individual piety, with only here and there a timid reference to our social and corporate duties and responsibilities. The church did not fight the advent of the new social world as she did that of the new intellectual world. In fact, until the world war shocked her out of her stupor, she did not seem to be aware that a new social world was growing up around her. As a consequence of the church's belated social awakening, the new social world, like the new intellectual world before it, has been growing up without being in-

[1] From an article by Dr. William Adams Brown, in the Christian Herald, May 14, 1921.

fluenced in any adequate degree by the ideals and principles of the kingdom of God. The horrible world war, the present titanic conflict between capital and labor, and the social revolutions and the general unrest that are rocking the whole social order from South Africa to Siberia, and from China to America, are all evidence of the lack of influence that our desocialized religion has had on our social life.

Religious education fails—and the church fails—unless the social ideals and principles of the kingdom of God are made to function in our social and corporate life.

Will the Church Rise to the Occasion?—If the church is to meet the obligations which religious education in an intellectual and social atmosphere like ours puts upon her, some radical readjustments must take place in her educational program. These readjustments must begin at the fountain sources—in the curricula and the teaching forces of our theological seminaries. Too few of our theological seminaries have made adequate efforts to adapt their program to the needs of the age. The curriculum of the average theological seminary to-day is practically what it was two hundred years ago. As a consequence of this mal-adjustment many of the young men who leave our theological institutions are poorly prepared for the ministry which our age demands of them. They are indoctrinated in world-views and in conceptions of growth and development which our age has outlived, and which no amount of earnestness can make appeal to the men and the women who are leading the way in the social progress of to-day. Many of them know the history of the ancient world better than they understand the spirit of the city in which they live. They may be able to analyze the different documents which make up the Old Testament, but they have not been prepared to analyze the mind and the spirit of the age to which they are to minister. Professor Shailer Mathews, of the Theological

Department of the University of Chicago, says in one of his recent books that our students for the ministry are prepared to read Hebrew, but that they are not prepared to read the signs of the times. We may question Dr. Mathews' statement that our students for the ministry are prepared to read Hebrew, but we agree with him that many of them are not prepared to read the signs of the times. And an educational institution that fails to prepare its students to read the signs of the times, fails in one of its most fundamental duties. Men who cannot read the signs of the times cannot serve the times. Such men are mere ciphers in the stern struggle for a better world. Until reconstruction begins here at the fountain sources,—until it begins with the preparation of our young men for the ministry,—religious education will not make any substantial progress. Reconstruction in the educational program of our theological seminaries would, in a generation or two, mean a reconstruction in the working theology of the average preacher.

It is a hopeful sign that some of our theological seminaries are finding their way out of the conventional rut, and are making thoughtful efforts to reconstruct their program so as to meet the demands which the intellectual and the social changes of the last half century have been making upon us. These progressive institutions do not fear to welcome into the field of theology the investigating spirit which is so characteristic of modern education. They have disabused their minds of the misconception that truth is primarily a matter of definitions —something that can be stated in intellectual formulas and sealed against future changes, as we preserve fruits and vegetables in sealed jars. They recognize the fact that truth is a living principle which, like all forms of life, adapts and readapts itself to its environment. The curriculum of these progressive theological seminaries is being changed to meet the demands of the new age. Obsolete courses are abandoned, or are placed on the optional

list, while required courses are given in the large and important field of applied Christianity. In the announcement of the Department of Home Service of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, for the year 1921, nineteen courses are listed which deal with various phases of social work, types of communities, surveys and administration, together with a study of interdenominational movements.

But while we rejoice over certain hopeful signs in the field of religious education, there is a note of alarm coming from another quarter. What is worse perhaps than the shortcomings of many of the old line theological seminaries is the recent advent of certain Bible Schools which are offering "short cuts' into the Christian ministry. These schools require very little intellectual preparation for entrance. They admit students from our primary schools, and in a short time send them out to preach. In addition to the inadequate mental training which they give, these schools are dominated by the pre-millennarian spirit, which is out of sympathy with the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God. The type of ready-made theology which is handed over the professor's counter to the students, most of whom are unable to do their own thinking, unfits them for the ministry which our age needs. In 1920, the Moody Bible School, in Chicago, and the Bible Institute, in Los Angeles, graduated more students than all the old line theological seminaries in the United States. Many of these graduates find their way into the vacant pulpits of our Protestant denominations. It is a serious matter when half of the men who enter the Christion ministry have no other equipment than a superficial piety, plus a smattering of theology that is wholly out of sympathy with the age in which they are to serve.

Quite recently the Bible School type of theology aroused the interest of certain social reactionaries—of a number of capitalists, who have become greatly disturbed over the

social Gospel of the kingdom, which has been speaking out so unpleasantly about the twelve hour day, the curse of child labor, and the right of the worker to share in the control of industry. When these capitalists discovered a brand of religion that has not the slightest interest in the social Gospel, but on the contrary passes all social reform on to the returning Messiah, they found just the thing that they were looking for. We were not at all surprised to learn of the recent courtship of capitalism and these Bible Schools. The schools want money, and the capitalists want schools that manufacture a brand of religion that blinks at exploitation. The Institution at Los Angeles is said to be largely financed by an oil magnate, while other sources of great wealth are interested in the Moody school at Chicago. The union of predatory wealth and premillennarian religion makes a combination of forces as injurious to the cause of the kingdom of God as the union of Roman politics and post-Apostolic Christianity after the days of Constantine. A great responsibility rests upon the few progressive old line theological seminaries, for it is to them that we must look for the counter-action of the anti-social influence that is being generated in these new "schools of the prophets."

The religious education that shall meet the requirements of the age, demands not only a reconstruction of the curriculum of the theological seminary, and of the working theology of the preacher, but a no less radical reconstruction of our liturgy and our hymnology. The liturgy and the hymns of all the Christian denominations are replete with obsolete conceptions and doctrines that can neither interest nor edify our age; while they are lamentably barren in those social conceptions and in those vital aspects of religion with which our age needs to be leavened. The only hymns in the average church hymnal that have any kind of social ring in them are re-expressions of old Hebrew hymns, foreign mission hyms, or patriotic selections. The vital religion which the king-

dom of God implies, and which the age demands, should be driven home to the hearts and minds of the people not only by the Sunday morning sermon and the mid-week Bible study, but also by the liturgy we use. The prayers that we offer, the responses that we read, and the hymns that we sing, should reinforce the message and the spirit of the sermon. As it is the effects of vital preaching are often nullified by the ritual we use in the rest of the service.

Some time ago I attended a baptismal or Christianing service in a church of another city. It was a beautiful service. It was an inspiration to see a dozen or more fathers and mothers before the altar with their children. The sermon was good. The preacher explained baptism as an act of solemn consecration. He made clear to those parents the duties and responsibilities which innocent childhood commits to us. The audience was deeply impressed by the good, common sense, Christian advice that was given. But what the preacher said in his sermon was contradicted in the rest of the service. The greater part of the liturgy, and all of the hymns that were sung, were out of harmony with the point of view of the sermon. Even the uninitated felt the jar of the conflicting trends of thought that were represented in the sermon and in the rest of the service.

In the spring of 1917, the Board of Health of our city established a baby clinic, and to encourage the good work, and to inspire my people to support it, I prepared a sermon on: The Healing Function of Religion, or Our Religious Duty to Men's Bodies. I looked for some hymns to reinforce my thoughts, but I looked in vain. Our hymnal did not contain a single hymn that breathed the spirit of my sermon. Very much is lost by this failure of the hymns and the liturgy to support our theology. Words like the following from the pen of J. W. Dawson, set to real devotional music, would have added very much to the effectiveness of my sermon that morning:

"Lover of souls indeed,
But lover of bodies too,
Seeing in human flesh
The God shine through;
Hallowed by thy name,
And for the sake of Thee,
Hallowed be all men,
For thine they be.

Doer of deeds divine,
Thou, the Father's Son,
In all thy children may
Thy will be done,
Till each works miracles
On poor and sick and blind,
Learning from thee the art
Of being kind."

Our liturgy should embody the social principles to which the church stands committed as an instrument of the kingdom of God. Nothing could more effectively instill the social spirit of the kingdom in the mind of the congregation than the repeating, for example, of a social creed like that of the Society of Friends, at the morning or evening worship. It would be more Christian, and vastly more sensible, than the constant repeating of creeds and conceptions which we know have neither interest nor meaning for our age. Our liturgy should contain prayers that breathe the social spirit of the kingdom of God. If the liturgy and the hymns would enable the congregation to unite in expressing the convictions of the sermon or the Sunday school lesson, the moral and the pedagogic effects of the service would be greatly enhanced. Our hymns and prayers could be made powerful factors in the inculcating of the kingdom spirit. But as it is the type of Christianity that is presented in the sermon and the Bible study is contradicted by the type that is presented in the devotional service; and the result is not orderly edification, but confusion in the mind of the worshippers.

Religious education is seriously handicapped so long as one part of the service contradicts what is said and done in other parts of it.

In this discussion I have gone on the assumption that the purpose of religious education is the inculcation of Christian principles and ideals, and the creation of a Christian attitude toward life, rather than instruction in certain facts and definitions. We may, of course, not lose sight of the fact that religious education cannot be divorced from instruction in certain personal and historical facts. The principles and the ideals that are to be inculcated are incarnated in certain individuals and institutions, and are inseparably connected with certain movements of history; and they must be taught in connection with instruction in the life of such individuals and in the facts connected with such historic movements. But there is a radical difference between the type of religious education that emphasizes, as its fundamental purpose, instruction in the facts of the Scriptures and the opinions of the church, and the type that emphasizes, as its fundamental purpose, the inculcation of the fundamental Christian principles and ideals. The latter is the type of religious education that the social theory of the kingdom of God implies. The religious education that is animated by any other purpose will fail to satisfy the needs of our age.

This change in the fundamental purpose of religious education implies also a change in the method of instruction. Facts and doctrines can be imparted by means of text books, class room lectures, and addresses; but principles we learn by doing rather than by hearing. It is only by doing, not by hearing, that we realize ideals. The type of religious education implied in this discussion demands what has been termed: *"education through participation,"* rather than *"education through impartation."* We must not only help our pupils to understand

the kingdom ideals and principles, but we must encourage them to practice the principles in their daily life,—in the home, in the school, and in the community. We must not only enlighten our church members in the social principles of the kingdom, but we must encourage and direct them in the practicing of these principles in the community in which they live.

Professor George Albert Coe, of the department of religious education in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, has been giving serious attention to this matter of religious education through the immediate participation of the pupils in the principles that are taught. His recent book: "A Social Theory of Religious Education," marks a new epoch in our country in this important field. It is a book that should be studied by theological professors, preachers, and Sunday school workers. It sets forth in clear and forceful language the new theory and method of religious education. In the Union School of Religion, which is supervised by Professor Coe himself, an attempt is made to carry out the theory advocated in the book. The children who attend the Union School of Religion are encouraged, under the direction and guidance of their teachers, to put into actual practice, as individuals and as classes, the principles that are taught in the class room. It is an attempt to teach Christian principles through the actual participation of the pupils in the principles, rather than through mere information in regard to the principles. It is a way of directly linking up our religious education with constructive efforts at building a better world.

IV

THE CHURCH AND DIVINE WORSHIP

The Christian church, as the logical successor of the Jewish Temple, has fallen heir to the sacred duty of leadership in divine worship. No other institution in

modern society is equipped, either in spirit or with the machinery, to render this service. Other institutions may be profoundly interested in certain aspects of the kingdom. Other agencies may teach brotherhood and practice mercy as persistently as the church. But it is to the church alone that we look for leadership in the matter of divine worship. She may not allow anything to dim her zeal in the prosecution of this fundamental duty. The present interest in social service must not be allowed to minimize the importance of the true worship of God. It is a discipline that we cannot afford to neglect on the peril of our individual souls and the soul of society. The average man would soon become forgetful of God and unmindful of his highest moral obligations, if it were not for the stated seasons of worship and for the specialized forms of worship. The majority of men, engrossed as they are in their business and their pleasure, would soon become unmindful of God if it were not for the Sundays that are set in between the busy weeks, when the church bids us drop the tools of labor from our hands and the cares of the world from our minds, and calls us into her quiet and holy precincts to worship God.

It is no mere fancy of the religious zealot, but a plain fact of history, that the most delicate sensibilities of our nature are dependent upon our relation to God. If we would forget God, which we might if it were not for the church's repeated calls to worship, the deterioration of our sense of moral values and purposes would inevitably follow. Certain ethical philosophers have denied that morality is in any way conditioned upon faith in God. Some have denied that a universal collapse of faith in God would affect social morality. But the testimony of history does not coincide with the conjecture of these philosophers. On the contrary, wherever a people ceased to worship their God or their gods, the result of their irreligion soon became manifest in their individual and their social life. History testifies to the fact that it is

better to worship gods made with hands than to worship no gods at all. The gods of a people, with rare exceptions, represent the highest ideals of the people. The pagan people of the past seldom, if ever, rose higher in their moral efforts than the ideals represented by the gods whom they formally worshiped. Even in the minds of the ignorant and superstitious the God whom we worship in the church on Sunday represents the highest and the best of everything that they can conceive of. Our Christian God is the incarnation of the loftiest ideals that the human mind is capable of conceiving or that the human heart is capable of feeling; and it is good to bow the knee to Him in devout and reverent worship.

There are many people, and their number seems to be increasing, who profess to have faith in the existence of God, and who believe in some form of divine worship, but who seem to feel no need of the church. Men who are above reproach frankly tell us that they can worship God at home, or in the woods and in the fields, as acceptably as they can in the church. A man, who was formerly an officer in one of our Allentown congregations, told me some time ago that he gets more satisfaction and benefit from the worship of God in nature or in art than he does from the formal worship of God in the church. He used to take his children to Sunday school and to church, but now he takes them for a walk into the fields or the woods on Sunday, or to a band concert, and frankly disclaims the feeling of any loss to himself or his children.

I, too, love nature and art. I, too, feel the presence of God in a fine piece of music, in a beautiful painting or statue, and especially in the divine "out-of-doors." But I want to guard against deceiving myself. I know that it is my sensuous nature rather than my spiritual nature that is stimulated as I sit on a mossy bank, under a green tree, beside a babbling brook. It is the pleasant sensation from the stimulation of my physical senses, and the elementary emotions that accompany such stimulation, that

I enjoy under the green tree. But the emotions that are created within me, and the effect which these emotions have on my will and my character, are of a higher order as I sit in a church that is dedicated to the highest Being that can be conceived of, and as I listen to the sermon and join with my family and my neighbors in the prayers and the hymns that are hallowed with age and with a thousand sacred associations, and all of which is addressed to that which is highest and noblest in me. I come back from the fields and the woods physically and mentally recreated, which is a good thing, especially in such strenuous times as these; but I come back from the church mentally and spiritually stimulated which is better.

Man is more than a sensuous creature. He is also a spiritual being. He has five physical senses by means of which he communicates with the material universe, and through which the material universe communicates with him. But he has also a sixth sense—a mystic sense—by means of which he apprehends the super-material, and through which the super-material communicates with him. Scientific introspection and psychological analysis will not disclose the presence of this mystic sense, but religious experience confirms it. Dr. Paul Moore Strayer has well said: "What differentiates the human from the brute is the sixth sense, the sense by which we apprehend what we cannot see, nor hear, nor feel, nor taste, nor smell. It is this spiritual faculty that gives to human life whatever fineness it possesses." [1] It is this spiritual or mystic sense that is nourished through divine worship in the church. From lack of proper nourishment, or from disuse, it will degenerate and finally die, just as the physical senses will. And when this mystic sense dies, our sense of God dies with it; and when our sense of God dies, the finest and noblest things that our human nature is capable of will speedily wither and die.

The church, with her specially designed buildings

[1] The Reconstruction of the Church, p. 118.

solemnly dedicated to the worship of God,—with her devout prayers and sacred hymns,—with her holy sacraments,—and with her many hallowed and sacred associations,—is the only institution in society that can cultivate this mystic sense which keeps us in touch with the Infinite. When the church rightly cultivates this spiritual faculty; when she guards it against the superstitions and the vagaries of which it is so susceptible; when she properly nourishes and directs it, she renders a service of profound individual and social significance. A righteous and lasting social order can be built only upon the character of a citizenship that worships a righteous and holy God. The nation that ceases to worship God, whether from theoretical or from practical motives, sows the seed of its own deterioration and ultimate destruction.

The present social order is seriously menaced by a most subtle kind of atheism. The atmosphere about us is being contaminated by a vulgar spirit that worships no God but material things, and that recognizes no sovereign ruler but its own desires. The majority of the people still believe that there is a God; but the God whom both the classes and the masses worship in their every day life is not the God of their belief, but the Mammon of their desires. There is a contradiction between their religious faith and their daily practice. The things of their faith are not as real to them as the things of their desires. What they see in the shop windows, or hear in the opera house, is more real to them than what they hear about in the church. The things that can be exchanged between us are more real than the God to whom we pray. A quotation from Wall Street, represents something more real than a "thus saith the Lord." The only real pleasures are those that add to our creature delights. The pleasures from an automobile trip, a banquet, a moving picture performance, or a new spring hat, are more real than the delight which the Psalmist experienced in the house of the Lord. The majority of the people still believe in a future

world,—in an endless life beckoning to the soul. The war has shown how deep-rooted and universal this belief is when a real test is made of it. But so far as the practice of the majority of the people is concerned the only real time is this present hour, which they are filling as full as possible with mere creature delights and satisfactions. In this materialistic atmosphere the finer things of our American life are withering and decaying. It is impossible to establish and maintain a righteous social order in an atmosphere of such vulgar materialism as this. The call to the reverent and thoughtful worship of God was never more urgent than to-day.

In Europe matters are worse than they are here in America. In certain sections of Europe systematic efforts have been made to rebuild the broken down social order on a strictly materialistic-atheistic foundation. Economic determinism is the only God recognized by the Soviet philosophy. The labor movement of Continental Europe has banished from its philosophical creed all spiritual conceptions such as God, the individual soul, and the future world. Its explanation of history is that of a pure economic determinism. All ideals are explained as pure economic reflexes. The only evils are economic evils, and the only good things are things of economic value. French syndicalism has been influenced somewhat by Bergson's idea of a creative evolution. But Bergson's influence has been felt only on the practical side of the movement. It has been conducive to direct creative action in industry, but that is all. Bergson's influence has not been able to replace the idea of God and of His creative purposiveness into the French labor movement. The labor movement of Continental Europe, from Paris to St. Petersburg, and from Berlin to Rome, is ready with a program for the reconstruction of society on a materialistic-atheistic foundation.

The doctrine of economic determinism contains a very large element of truth. Economic values are among the

greatest values, and economic motives are among the strongest motives. But when economic determinism is made the whole truth—when economic values are made the only values and economic motives the only motives—the doctrine becomes a dangerous untruth. This is the most serious defect in the modern labor philosophy. The great labor movement, which represents one of the mightiest forces in our modern life, would relegate the worship of God to the scrap-heap of worn out superstitions.

It has been the opinion of the greatest statesmen of history that such an attempt at social rebuilding is futile. Pericles, the wisest of the Greek statesmen, said: "There never was and there never can be a state successfully built and maintained on an atheistic foundation." Of similar import is the judgment of the Hebrew statesman-prophet who said: "Where there is no vision the people perish (i. e., go astray).". . . "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." Plato warned his age against the destruction of the popular faith in the gods because of the wholesome moral and social value of such faith. The judgment of these men was based upon solid facts which they had observed. It grew out of the actual experience of their own people. In Israel, in Greece, and in Rome, every widespread and extended period of absentation from the temples was followed by a wave of atheism; and every such wave of atheism was followed by a lapse in individual and social morality.

It might not be impossible to build and maintain a certain kind of social order on a materialistic-atheistic foundation. But I am convinced of the impossibility of building and maintaining a just and fraternal social order such as the kingdom of God implies upon an atheistic foundation, and in a mammonistic atmosphere. A social order that aims at righteousness, justice, and holy love for all mankind, can be built only on the character of a citizenship that bows the knee in thoughtful, reverent worship of the God whom Jesus Christ has revealed. When

the church leads us in such worship she renders a real service,—a service not only for the individual worshipper, but for the social order in all its departments.

But divine worship, fundamental as it is in our religious life, must not be made an end in itself. It is only a means to a higher end. It is only a means of lifting us into the presence of God to become sanctified and strengthened for service on earth. There were times when the church made too much of divine worship. There were times when all the requirements of religion were exhausted in the act of formal worship in the church. When a man worshipped God in the sanctuary on the Lord's Day he did all that religion required of him. That is a serious error. When we make divine worship an end in itself we degrade it into a species of idolatry. Divine worship must not be substituted for divine service, for it is only a means to it. If our formal worship of God in the church has no wholesome effect on our dealings with our neighbors, as was the case in the days of Amos and Micah, it deserves our criticism. If worship in the Temple unfits us to do our duty to an unfortunate man, as it did the priest and the Levite in the Parable of the Good Samaritan, it becomes an evil rather than a good.

The church of the future must maintain a rational equilibrium between divine worship and divine service,—between the worship of God in the sanctuary and the service of humanity outside of the sanctuary. By means of divine worship we must ascend the Mount of Transfiguration where we hold communion with the Infinite, and from thence we must again descend into the valley of common toil and trial,—down into the homeless homes and among our sin-wrecked brothers, to help them rise to the level of our own richer, fuller, and happier life. Dr. Harry Emmerson Fosdick, in a sermon to his New York congregation, a few Sundays ago, said: "This is not divine service. This is only getting ready for it. Divine service

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

will begin to-morrow morning out there amid the din and the dust of business, in a fight for a Christian world." Through divine worship in the church on Sunday we are to gain inspiration and help for the fight for the Christian world, or the kingdom of God.

THE CHURCH AND THE EXTENSIVE GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM OR THE PROBLEMS OF EVANGELIZATION

CHAPTER THREE

THE CHURCH AND THE EXTENSIVE GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM, OR THE PROBLEMS OF EVANGELIZATION

EVANGELIZATION—the publishing of the "good news" which Jesus came to proclaim is the first kingdom-duty that has been entrusted to us. The fundamental principles of the kingdom—the universal Fatherhood of God, the universal brotherhood of man, and all the individual and social implications which follow logically from these two fundamental principles—shall be declared in such a way as to inspire the interest and the faith of the people. The first step in the building of the kingdom of God is the winning of formal acceptance of its principles and purposes. *This is the task of evangelism.*

Because of the quite general identification of the church and the kingdom, the problems of evangelism have been considered the problems of the church rather than the problems of the kingdom of God. The purpose of evangelism has been the recruiting of members for the church rather than the inspiring of interest and faith in the principles and purposes of the kingdom. In her evangelistic efforts the church has put before the people a program of her own rather than the program of the kingdom of God. In many respects the program of the church has been identically the same as the program of the kingdom, while in other respects it has differed radically from it both in content and in spirit. If the church had always faithfully declared the principles and purposes of the kingdom, then the attitude of the people toward the church

would at the same time be an indication of their attitude toward the kingdom of God. But as it is, the response of the people to our evangelistic efforts must be interpreted as an indication of their attitude toward the church and her program rather than of their faith in the kingdom of God and its purposes. This fact somewhat relieves the present evangelistic situation. The widespread indifference to the church would be exceedingly disheartening if it were at the same time an indication of an equally widespread indifference to the principles and purposes of the kingdom of God. But this is not the case. There is assuring evidence, both within the church and outside of it, of confidence and interest in the principles of the kingdom of God when they are properly presented to the people. Whether all the people, or even the majority of them, can ever be recruited for the kingdom of God is too remote a matter even for speculation. But I am confident that the program of the kingdom of God—a program that includes everything that concerns life here and hereafter—will inspire a response on the part of those people whose character and influence determine the policy and the destiny of the community and of the world.

Since the Christian church is the only institution that has been specially entrusted with the duty of extending the kingdom over the earth, it is not possible to make a study of the growth of the kingdom apart from the work of the church. And since the program of the church is in many vital respects identical with the program of the kingdom, we must, in a sense, gauge the progress of the kingdom by the progress of the church.

I shall devote this discussion of evangelism to the following questions: *What progress has been made in the matter of evangelizing the world? What is the present situation? And how may we do better in the future?*

I

THE TALE OF STATISTICS

Evidence of a Healthy Growth.—Much has been accomplished. The one hundred and twenty believers at the time of Jesus' death have grown into a vast army of approximately 500,000,000. From the circumscribed land of the Jews, Christianity has spread out over the earth and has become rooted in every land under the sun. The mustard seed, planted by the Master's own hand, and nurtured by his faithful followers in every land and age, has grown into the biggest thing in the world.

And not only is there evidence of the substantial growth of Christianity in the past, but there are encouraging signs of renewed life and energy at the present time. There was more evangelistic zeal manifested during the last two decades than at any other time since the days of the Apostles. Among the encouraging things is the notable increase in our offerings for benevolence. Not only local congregations, but whole denominations, have doubled, tripled, and in some cases even quadrupled their offerings for Christian missions during the last two decades. Since 1901 the Protestant churches of North America have increased their offerings for Foreign Missions over 300%. The increase in the church's contributions for Home Misisons, and for all other benevolent purposes, has been equally encouraging. The Inter-Church World Movement of North America has just completed a campaign to raise a sum of money for religious purposes that would have been impossible to conceive of at any other time in the history of the church.

There has also been an appreciable increase in the membership of the Christian church both at home and abroad. The increase in the membership of the religious forces of the United States during the last twenty six years has been 94%, while a few of the Protestant bodies have more than doubled their membership during this period. And dur-

ing the last two decades the percentage of increase in the membership of the Christian church in the non-Christian lands has been greater than in the home lands.

More notable still is the recent development of missionary machinery, and the unprecedented zeal in the dissemination of missionary intelligence. Missionary societies, whose only aim and purpose is the propagation of Christianity, have been multiplied by thousands all over the world during the last quarter of a century. Every denomination is organized for efficient missionary activity. Missionary education has been receiving special attention in every Protestant denomination. Hundreds of denominational and inter-denominational missionary conferences are being held each year for the purpose of disseminating missionary intelligence and of creating missionary enthusiasm. The individual congregations have become organized for more effective missionary work. Every live congregation has a special department to direct its missionary and benevolent operations. Mission study classes are being conducted in almost every Protestant congregation in the country. These things give occasion for rejoicing in Zion.

Evidence of Weakness.—But there is also another side to the tale of statistics, and it is well that we should give it thoughtful consideration. In our reports to ecclesiastical bodies, and at our missionary conferences, we have been in the habit of speaking about the things that we have accomplished, while we have ignored the things that we have failed to accomplish. We have been deceiving ourselves in this way. To get a true conception of the evangelistic problem we must do more than study the church, and tabulate the progress she has made. To see what progress has really been made we must gauge the pace of the church by the pace of the world. When we do this we are forced to the conclusion that the problems of evangelism are about as far from solution as they ever were.

While the membership of the church has been notably increased, the population of the world has also increased in about the same proportion; and unless the church will greatly accelerate her evangelistic pace she will not be able to overtake the world.

In spite of all our foreign missionaary efforts we have only touched the borders of the great non-Christian world. Even in such countries as India, China, and Japan, where Christian missions have made most progress, we have reached only a few people in the larger cities, while the smaller cities and towns, and the great rural population, remain practically untouched. The report of 3,167,614 communicant members of the Christian church in the non-Christian world, with 1,869,145 enrolled in the Sunday Schools, and with an additional 1,500,000 adherents, may be very encouraging when not compared with what is still unaccomplished. These figures represent great courage and noble sacrifice on the part of our faithful missionaries. But the evangelistic problem can be appreciated only when we compare this insignificant number of Christians with the vast non-Christian population of one billion souls.

Even in our own country the evangelistic problem is about as far from solution as it was at any other time of our history. According to the latest statistics there are about 45,000,000 people in the United States above the normal age of church membership who are not affiliated with any Christian church, Protestant or Catholic. That means that more than half of the adult citizens of this great Christian country are still material for evangelization. And only about 26,000,000 of the adult population of the country are nominally affiliated with the Protestant church. That means that two out of every three adults throughout the length and breadth of this great Protestant stronghold are still outside of the Protestant church. And 69.3% of all the young people of the country under twenty-five years of age are unaffiliated with any of our schools of religious instruction. In spite of the fact that the

religious bodies of the United States almost doubled their membership during the last twenty-six years, the country is just as far from being evangelized as it was at the beginning of this period.

Dr. Josiah Strong, a short time before he died, warned us against the fallacy of assuming that we are on a fair way of evangelizing our country. In an article in the *Gospel of the Kingdom* he said: "It is not the actual growth of the church that is significant; . . . but this growth as compared with that of the country; and during the last half of the nineteenth century the rate of gain of the Protestant churches in the United States was only one-fourth as great as it had been during the first half of the century; and during the twenty years from 1880 to 1900, it was only one-fourth as great as it had been during the preceding thirty years; while during the ten years from 1890 to 1900, it was only one-third as great as during the preceding decade; that is, during the last ten years of the century the rate of gain on the population was only one-sixteenth as great as during the first half of the century. We must not be surprised to learn, therefore, that from 1900 to 1910 there was no gain whatever on the population, and each year since there has been a slight loss." That means that during the last century the Protestant church has really made no progress at all in the matter of Protestantizing our country, since the population of the country has grown in the same ratio as the membership of the Protestant church.

Dr. Strong's statement was not taken seriously by the church at the time. I recollect that some one took occasion to dispute the truth of his claim. The figures given in the Federal Council's "Year Book," which has been our final court of appeal in all matters of religious statistics, seemed to contradict the figures given by Dr. Strong. The "Year Book" for 1917 states that in 1890 the total religious strength of the country was 20,618,000, and that the net increase for the twenty-six years following was 19,-

399,000, or 94%, while the gain in the population of the country for this same period was 39,000,000, or only 61%. From this, and similar statements, we superficially inferred that we were making commendable progress in evangelizing our country. But the statistician of the "Year Book" summed up all the religious gains of the country, including not only the Catholics, but also the Eastern Orthodox bodies, and some other bodies whom many good church people consider fit subjects for evangelization. One thing that very considerably raised the percentage as given in the "Year Book" was the gain of the Catholic church during this period. But the Catholic gains were almost entirely from the large influx of immigrants from Catholic Europe. The Catholic gain on this side of the Atlantic was cancelled by the Catholic loss on the other side. The Catholic Church has not been able to gain any substantial hold on the non-Catholic element of our population.

Quite recently a number of local studies were made of the grip the Protestant church has on the population of the comunity, and in each case, so far as I have been able to discover, these studies have confirmed the position taken more than a decade ago by the pioneer, Dr. Strong. A study of the grip the church has on the community was made in our own city, a few years ago, by Professor James H. S. Bossard, then head of the department of sociology in Muhlenburg College. [1] This study showed that the Catholic church made surprising gains in our city since 1890. The membership of the Catholic church increased 710.3% during this period. But this gain was due to the assimilation of the large influx of Catholic immigrants from Europe, and not to any special hold that the Catholic church has gotten on our community. The Catholic church has been recruiting very little of the non-Catholic element of our city. All that the Catholic church has been able to do is to assimilate a portion of her own

[1] The churches of Allentown.

people who come to us from the other side of the Atlantic.

Professor Bossard devoted the main part of his study to the native Protestant element of our population, and he found that the percentage of increase of the Protestant church from 1890 to 1917 was only a little higher than the percentage of increase of the native element of the population of fifteen years of age and upward. During these twenty-seven years the Protestant churches increased their membership 111%, while the native element of the population, from fifteen years and upward, increased 100%. While Allentown is, in a sense, a typical industrial city, the Pennsylvania Germans, who compose the major portion of the native element of the population, are more devoted to the church both by temperament and by training than the native element of the average American community. Allowance must also be made for the fact that at least 60% of the 100% increase in the population of our city from 1890 to 1917 came from within a radius of twenty miles from the city, a rural territory in which church life is still at its best. During the last decade, however, our citizenship has become more cosmopolitan; and because of this the grip of the church has become weaker. During the last ten years the increase in the membership of the Protestant church has not equalled the increase in the population of the city.

In the majority of American cities of our size the membership of the Protestant church has not kept pace with the growth of the population during the last decade or two. Recent surveys have revealed scores of instances where the Protestant church has been falling back in the race with the population of the community. This is especially true in the case of the larger cities, and in our industrial centers. There are twenty-two cities in the United States whose population increased more than 100% from 1900 to 1910, while in every case, but one, so far as I have been able to discover, the membership of the Protestant church failed to keep pace with the growth of the population of

6415

the city. During the period from 1910 to 1920 the gap between the population of our leading cities and the membership of our Protestant churches has been considerably widened. This is a serious matter. The power of the country is being centered more and more in the big cities. In the degree that the church loses her hold on the big cities she loses her hold on the nation.

And not only has the membership of the Protestant church failed to keep pace with the rapid growth of the population of our cities, but she has also failed, during the last decade or two, to distribute her new missions and to adjust her work so as to make her influence felt where it is most needed. Vast sections of our great cities are growing up without the service and the influence of the church. So far as I have been able to observe, we have studiously avoided rather than sought the sections which most need our help when we locate new churches. The question is not: where can this new mission be of most help to the people and to the community, but where will it be likely to come to self-support soonest? We have been seeking a nucleus of people of our own particular denominational beliefs and practices, rather than the people who are most in need of the encouragement and ministry of the Gospel. The interests of the church as an institution, or the interests of a particular denomination, are the ends sought, rather than the welfare of the people. We have been unmindful of the fact that the interests of the kingdom are always identified with the welfare of the people, rather than with the numerical growth of a denomination.

Another thing that is to be deplored is the inclination of established congregations to abandon the sections to which the poor, the toilers, and the foreigners are gravitating. The church that is being surrounded by the "barbarians" will relocate, rather than make an effort to Christianize or to Americanize the "barbarians." The churches have been following the "better class" as it moves into the newer and better sections of our cities, or into the

more exclusive suburbs. The reports for 1914 of five of our largest and most influential denominations show that almost one hundred of their congregations relocated in that one year. Was it kingdom-interest or self-interest that moved them? Was it the natural spirit of self-preservation, or the kingdom-spirit of service, that animated them? In the kingdom of God he who seeks to save his life will ultimately lose it, while he who is willing to give his life in unselfish service will save it. In many cases the discarded church properties were sold for commercial purposes; and, in one instance of which I have knowledge, the former house of worship was degraded into a saloon. In very few cases have the churches attempted any religious work, or any constructive community service, in the sections from which they moved. They have scarcely left their foot-prints on the filthy and neglected streets from which the poor, forlorn aliens might take courage.

If a congregation can no longer maintain itself in its old location, which is very often the case, it would be good evangelism for our Mission Boards to support such a congregation in the community where self-support has become impossible, but where the need of religious services and the influence of the church have become more imperative than ever. Such a procedure would be more in harmony with the spirit of the kingdom of God than the investing of large sums of money in the establishing and maintaining of new churches in the aristocratic sections of our cities. Or the discarded church properties might be maintained as community welfare-centers under denominational supervision. If some suitable persons were supported as community welfare-workers at such abandoned preaching stations a greater service might be rendered to the kingdom of God and to the cause of Americanization than by supporting half a dozen new missions in the exclusive suburbs. Or the different denominations that were formerly interested in these quarters where our

sectarian church work is no longer possible, might unite in maintaining a community-church which, through the joint support and patronage of the denominations, could be equipped to render a real service. But this has rarely been done. Vast sections in our great cities are thus left to grow up without the care of the church. Great multitudes of people, massed together under the most unwholesome physical and moral conditions, are left without any real religious influence. The most neglected sections are invariably the quarters where the poor, the city's toilers, and the aliens live. Here is where population, disease, crime, and social discontent breed fastest, and where the leavening influence of the religion of the kingdom of God is most needed. But we have avoided rather than sought these sections.

Another thing that we have noticed in our study of statistics is that the church has been losing her grip on the men. In spite of the recent laymen's movement in the churches, which has enlisted multitudes of men for service; and in spite of the encouraging crowds at many of our men's conferences, the figures show that there is a shortage of man-power in the churches. In 1915 there were 3,000,000 fewer men than women in the Christian churches of the country. In that year, according to a statement made in the *Gospel of the Kingdom,* "the male membership of the Protestant churches made up only 18.7% of the adult male population of the country; while the Catholic church, including all baptized children, made up only 13.2%. The male element in all the Christian churches of the country, including the baptized male children of the Catholic church, comprised only 31.9% of the adult male population of the country." That means that sixty-nine out of every one hundred men in the United States are outside of the Christian Churches. If we eliminate the Catholic children under fifteen years of age, we can count only about twenty-eight men out of every one hundred for the Christian church. And there has

been a constant decrease in the ratio between the male membership of the Christian church and the male population of the country ever since economic disturbances and social unrest have been on the increase.

If these statistics are correct, and we have reasons to believe that they are, what conclusion shall we draw? Are the men of to-day more irreligious than the women? It was not always so. Or has our religion in some way become effeminated, and thus lost its power to appeal to men? The religion of Jesus, and primitive Christianity, appealed to men; and there is something vitally wrong with the religion that ceases to do so. The religion of the kingdom of God is a virile religion, and I am confident that it will appeal to manly men if it is presented to them in a manly way.

And, finally, the statisticians inform us that attendance at the regular church services is on the wane. I take no interest in any odious comparisons between our day and the good old days of our forefathers. We know little about the good old days, for our forefathers did not compile statistics on church attendance. Whether fewer people attend church now-a-days than formerly we do not know, and have no way of knowing; but we do know that too few are attending church in our day. We have succeeded in recruiting only a fraction of our population, and only a fraction of this fraction attends church with any degree of regularity. It is only quite recently, and only in a few communities, that any reliable studies of church attendance were made. But wherever such studies have been made the disclosures have not been very encouraging.

Professor Bossard, in the study previously referred to, gave special atention to the matter of church attendance. The studies were made in 1912, and again in 1917; and I know of no investigation that was conducted with greater fairness to the church. His conclusion was that the

Catholic church, with eight organizations[1] ministering to 11,344 members, comes into weekly touch with the majority of its people; while the Protestant church, with fifty-seven organizations[2] ministering to 21,193 members comes into weekly touch with only about one-fourth of its people. During the period when the counts were taken 25.7% of the Protestant membership attended the morning service, and 33.7% the evening service. Making due allowance for the probable number of visitors and the larger children who were counted as members, it appears that only about one out of every four of our Protestant church members attended the Sunday church services during the extended periods when the investigations were made. From the facts that had been gathered, Professor Bossard concluded that the Protestant churches of Allentown come into weekly touch with only about one out of every eight or ten of the native Protestant element of the population of our city.

And we have reasons to believe that church attendance in Allentown is above the average for the country at large. I said before that the Pennsylvania German is more devoted to his church by temperament and training than the average American citizen; and he is for this reason also more regular in his church attendance. And Professor Bossard admits that the percentage given in his study of church attendance in Allentown is likely too high, for in his method of taking the count and striking the averages he always gave the church the benefit of the doubt. Allowance must also be made for the fact that no investigations were made during the College vacation period when church attendance is at its poorest. It is quite safe to say that the percentage of church attendance given in Professor Bossard's study is considerably above the average for the average American community.

[1] In 1912.
[2] In 1912.

From the studies which I made during the last few years I would judge that about 30% of the membership of our Protestant churches seldom go to church; that about 50% of them go more or less periodically, i. e., at special seasons, and on special occasions; and that not more than 20% of them go to church with dependable regularity. In our Sunday School work we have not succeeded any better. Only about 30% of the young people under twenty-five years of age are enrolled in our Sunday Schools; and, according to information given out by recent surveys, only about 5% of the number enrolled attend all the services of the school, while more than half of the pupils attend less than half of the sessions. In the average American city, the Protestant churches, through their regular Sunday and mid-week services, do not get into touch with more than one out of every ten or fifteen of the population. In San Francisco the Protestant churches, through their regular services, reach only one out of every twenty-seven of the city's population, and in Boston only one out of every fifteen. It is no cause for rejoicing in our Protestant Zion to learn that we have recruited only about 26% of the population of our country, and that we come into weekly touch with only about 20% of those whom we have recruited. Thus runs the tale of statistics.

Making due allowance for considerable mis-information, and also for some misrepresentation on the part of the statisticians, it is nevertheless clear that the evangelistic task, both at home and abroad, was never more urgent than to-day. The world is moving on with a little more momentum than the church. In spite of her revived missionary zeal, the church is, at the present time, playing a losing game. I fear that the church's moral influence on the average American community has suffered a more serious set back than her grip on the population. Not only has her power to draw men been waning, but

her ability to mould public sentiment and to inspire the individual and the social conscience has been waning to a still greater degree.

But this tale of statistics is not a swan's song. The church is not a spent-force, as many would have us believe. She has been showing signs of weakening, but she still has a good fund of reserve vitality. She will regain her breath and will come back into the race with new determination. I have faith that the diagnosis of the situation, which is being made by many of the church's true friends, will arouse her to give herself with her immense resources to the solution of the problems.

II

THE EVANGELISTIC PROBLEMS IN THE NON-CHRISTIAN LANDS

The Need of Men and of Money.—In the non-Christian world the work of Christian missions is still a matter of propaganda. It is clear that we who have the Gospel must bring it to those who have it not, for "how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?" [1] For a long time to come we must spare from our work here at home many of our best and ablest men and women who, by their teaching and by their conduct, will inject the ideals of the kingdom of God into the society of the non-Christian world. And for a long time to come we must consecrate much of our money for the support of our missionaries, and for the equipping and maintaining of our missionary institutions. For several generations, perhaps for several centuries, the evangelistic work in the non-Christian world must be directed by alien missionaries and supported by foreign money.

The Goal of Foreign Missions.—But the object of

[1] Romans 10: 14.

Foreign Missions is not to find enough men and women, and to gather enough American and European money, to publish the facts of the Gospels throughout the non-Christian world in a specified time. The real aim must be to establish enough self-supporting native churches, and to train a sufficient number of native Christians, who will feel the responsibility for the ultimate evangelization and christianization of their own people. No country will even be evangelized, much less christianized, save through the efforts of a self-supporting native church that is free from the control of foreigners. The alien missionary is indispensable at the present stage of the work, both as teacher and as superintendent; but he must assume the rôle of leadership only as long as it is really necessary. As soon as the native church is able to support itself and to assume the responsibility for the management of its own affairs, it should be encouraged to do so. It is only in this way that the full strength of the native church can be developed. The Oriental people, among whom Christianity had its beginnings, may yet make an important contribution to its development. But such contribution will not be made if foreign missions are interpreted to mean the enforcing of our particular type of Christianity upon the Orient.

Foreign Missions demand a Religion that answers the Needs of Life.—The non-Christian world will not be evangelized, either by alien missionaries or by native Christians, who have nothing to offer but our formal type of Christianity, whether it be the dogmatic or the ecclesiastical type. Merely preaching a new religion to the non-Christian people, many of whom are already over-religious, will not meet with success. No amount of polemics against their religions, and no amount of apologetics in favor of the Christian religion, will win them. A few may be reached in this way, but the great majority will not respond to that kind of evangelism. The im-

ported religion must demonstrate its practical superiority over the native religions, or be foredoomed to failure. The foreign missionary must show, not so much by his message as by his every-day ministry among the people, that his religion is better than theirs. Serviceableness, or the ability to produce noble character and livable conditions, is the only kind of apologetics that will meet with success. Not by rhetoric, nor by logic, but by life, must the foreign missionary prove that his religion is the true religion.

The history of primitive Christianity is proof of this fact. The prime factor in rooting Christianity in the foreign soil of the Greco-Roman world was that it answered the needs of life as none of the native religions did. In our efforts to explain the foreign missionary triumphs of the Apostles and their immediate successors we may perhaps have over-emphasized the miraculous help of the Spirit, while we have overlooked the natural drawing power that was inherent in the social ministry of the new religion. In trying to understand how that little band of foreign missionaries, without funds, and with no home church to back them up, could root Christianity so firmly in that hostile pagan soil as to make it impossible for a century and a half of systematic persecution to uproot it, we may not overlook the fact that the religion which they represented, wherever it became established, created a new type of community life which proved a strong attraction for the masses of pagan society. In the new Christian community the masses of the Greco-Roman world found that friendship and fellowship for which they had been hungering in vain.

It is true that there were a number of things in primitive Christianity that appealed to the conglomerate population of the Greco-Roman world. The absolute conviction of the Apostles that Jesus was the Messiah won a favorable hearing from many of the Jews. The new religion's clear note of personal immortality, based upon

the concrete fact of the resurrection of Jesus, appealed to a certain class of Greeks in whom the desire for immortality was a racial instinct. The new religion's conception of God as the Father of each individual appealed very strongly to the masses of all races. The individualism and the idealism of Christianity struck a responsive chord in the hearts of many people whose individuality was sacrificed in the interest of the state, and whose personal rights were never recognized. It was an inspiration to the common man to learn that he was a child of the great God and, therefore, a being of infinite value.

But the thing that proved the chief attraction in primitive Christianity was not something in its theology, but the plain fact that life in the new Christian community was of a higher order than in the pagan world outside. The members of the Christian community were cleaner and nobler than their pagan neighbors. And, what was of more significance still, in the new community all were recognized as brothers—*real brothers*—whether Jew or Gentile, master or slave, lettered or unlettered. The new Christian community was a unique social unit, ethically superior to anything that existed anywhere in pagan society. The members shared not only a common faith and a common loyalty, but also a common life. The spirit of actual brotherhood expressed by the Christian communism, the social equality that was experienced at the love feasts, and the large-hearted hospitality that existed everywhere among the Christians—the hospitality that gave the Christian a welcome and a foothold in any strange place in the world—did more to win converts for the early church than any theological discourses that the disciples were capable of delivering, or than any passionate appeals to individuals, could have accomplished. Chief among the factors in the foreign missionary success of the Apostles was the fact that Christianity made life more livable than any other agency in society. The people saw that the new religion meant something for

their everyday burdened life which the other religions had not given them; and that was one reason—I am convinced that it was the main reason—why so many espoused the cause of Christianity in the face of inevitable persecution and probable death.

Harnack [1] and Uhlhorn [2] furnish material for the painting of a most beautiful picture of the helping hand which the primitive Christian church extended to her members. She cared for her needy widows and orphans. The church at Rome had at least fifteen hundred such dependents under her care in the year 250 A. D. In addition to a poor fund, the proceeds of which were devoted to the needs of the poorer members, the church also maintained a burial fund which was used to give honorable burial to those members who lacked the necessary means. The significance of this can be understood only as we appreciate that in many of the ancient communities honorable burial was one of the most coveted boons. Few things were dreaded more than unceremonial or dishonorable burial. The churches cared for the needs and the comforts of the families of those who were imprisoned or exiled for their faith. On numerous occasions the church ransomed those members who were imprisoned for debts which they could not pay, but were willing to pay. It is a matter of common knowledge that the early church urged upon her members the duty of honest work; but it is not generally known that the primitive church was actively interested in the matter of unemployment. When a Christian was out of work the churches assumed the responsibility of finding work for him, or else gave him financial aid while out of work. The churches befriended their members in any misfortune that befell them. In public calamities such as famine, pestilence, or persecution, large relief offerings were sent to distant places, and to people altogether unknown to the givers. The primi-

[1] The gospel of Love and Charity, Chapter 3, Book II, of "The Expansion of Christianity."

[2] "The History of Christian Charity in the Ancient Church."

tive church was of immense practical help to her people. The church took the place in the life of her members of our modern lodges or fraternal societies with their sick and death benefits. The individual Christian found in the church not only a place where he could worship God, but also a social haven where he could safely anchor without the paralyzing fear of being swept out into the merciless sea by the social undertow. And one of the specially fine things about this primitive Christian charity was the fact that the personal element was not lost in it. The givers and the recipients lived together in close personal contact. The men who gave the help and the men who received it were brothers—*real brothers.* It was very different in this respect from much of the later charity of the church, and particularly from our modern institutional charity where a big institution is placed between the needy inmates and the kid-gloved supporters of the institution. The personal touch of the primitive Christian charity was the most socially uplifting thing about it.

This social service—this practical help which the primitive Christian church extended to her members—was the chief factor in the rooting of Christianity in the Greco-Roman world. This was more especially the case since the church, for more than two centuries, had to recruit her members largely from the lower and from the lower middle classes—people who could hardly understand Paul's theology, but who could and did appreciate the practical difference which the new religion made in their lives.

It would be a mistake to infer that the communism of primitive Christianity—if we may call it communism at all—was an attempt at economic reconstruction in accordance with a theory derived from the principles of their religion. The early Christians were not conscious of the social implications of their religion. Their practice of communism had nothing at all to do with the production of goods; only with the use of it. No one

was compelled, or even asked, to deed his property to the community. Nor was any one who did sell his property requested to give all of the proceeds to the community. Ananias and Sapphira had a perfect right, as members of the Christian community, to keep for themselves a part of the proceeds from the sale of their property. What they had no right to do, as Christians, was to lie and act the hypocrite in the matter. There was no legislation on the subject. The disposal of one's property in the interest of the community was at no time made a condition of membership in the Apostolic church. Some of the leading spirits in the Christian movement retained their personal property, or at least a part of it. Property was sold and the proceeds donated for common use only as occasions arose to make it necessary. The primitive Christian communism was purely the result of the fraternal spirit of Jesus which so possessed his followers that they were constrained to devote all that they were and all that they had to the service of one another. The Master's command that they should love one another as he loved them was made the guiding principle of their daily conduct rather than an article in their religious creed.

It is true, as has frequently been pointed out, that the donation of their personal property to the community was made comparatively easy by the belief that they were living in the last days. The majority of the early Christians—perhaps all of them—believed that the Master would return to destroy or to transform the existing social order before their generation would pass away. Under the tension of such a belief property considerations cease to be the controlling factor in human conduct that they usually are. A conviction like that is a great social leveller. But while all this is true, it is also true that the unique spirit of brotherhood which placed each individual's possessions, whether of life or of goods, at the service of his fellows, was a much more universal

and enduring practice among the Christians than is usually supposed. It was not discontinued after the first unsuccessful experiment in Jerusalem. Nor did it die out after the passing away of the first generation of Christians. The Epistle of Barnabas, which, according to Harnack, was written as late as 131 A. D., says: "Thou shalt communicate in all things with thy neighbors; thou shalt not call things thine own; for if ye are partakers in common of things that are incorruptible, how much more of those things that are corruptible." Justin, who was not converted to Christianity until after 135 A.D., says: "We who were before occupied by preference with possessions and goods, now bring what we have to the community, and share it with every one who hath need." The Roman satirist Lucian, writing as late as 180 A. D., says: "It was impress upon them (i. e. the Christians) by their original law-giver that they were all brothers, . . . with the result that they despise all worldly goods alike, regarding them merely as common property." From the testimonies of these eminent authorities it is evident that the unique fraternal spirit which placed the individual Christian and his possessions at the service of his fellow Christians prevailed in the Christian communities for a period of at least a century and a half. The fraternal spirit which radiated from the Founder of Christianity continued to create unique social units in the old pagan social order until those non-Christian elements, which became incorporated into Christianity and to which attention was called in the last chapter, began to smother the social spirit of the original Gospel.

Whatever other factors contributed to the foreign missionary triumphs of primitive Christianity, there is no doubt that the chief factor was the unique social element in it—the fraternal spirit which made life more livable in the Christian community than in the unsocial pagan world outside. No amount of prayer, and no amount of

persuasive eloquence or of missionary enthusiasm, could have accomplished for primitive Christianity what its social ministry among the people whom it sought to win accomplished. Its chief recommendation lay in the type of individuals it produced and the kind of community-life it created. "Behold how these Christians love one another," was the unsolicited tribute that pagan society paid to the new religion that had made its way into the empire. This tribute explains why so many people were ready to espouse its cause in the face of persecution and death. It was a religion worth dying for.

This same impression of serviceableness foreign missions must make on the modern non-Christian world, or fail to conquer it. The Christianity which we export to the non-Christian people must, in a practical way, prove its superiority over the native religions, or fail in its efforts to dispossess them. Christianity must do more than give the heathen a new intellectual conception of God and of salvation. It must demonstrate its power to heal their physical diseases, to alleviate their distressing poverty, and to lighten the heavy social burdens which are crushing the masses of Oriental society, or it will fail to receive a hearing from the majority of the people. Why should they give up their own religion for another merely because they are told by a stranger that theirs is wrong and that the stranger's is right? They cannot be expected to do it unless the imported religion will, like primitive Christianity in the Roman empire, demonstrate its practical superiority over their own cults.

If the Christian church in her ministry among the miserable people of the Orient were to carry out the instructions of an acknowledged English authority of a generation ago she would fail, and would deserve to fail. This eminent divine, in his instructions to the outgoing missionaries of his denomination, said: "The duty of the missionary is to preach the Gospel, and nothing else but

what helps preach the Gospel. His converts may be poor and uncivilized; but that is not his affair; the poor must have the Gospel preached to them, that is his sole duty." [1] Such advice as this is not only unchristian, but foolish. A Gospel that has nothing at all to do with poverty and barbarism and human misery is not a Christian Gospel, and deserves to fail.

On the contrary, a Gospel ministry whose purpose is to save the poor heathen from his social hell here on earth as well as from the theological hell hereafter; a Gospel that aims to make the heathen's life more livable; a crusade against tuberculosis which is decimating the Japanese people; a campaign against the pneumonic plague which frequently devastates large parts of China and Manchuria; rescue work among the multitudes of fallen women; hospitals for the lepers; and institutions for the many blind, will ultimately recruit more people for Jesus Christ than an equal amount of money and energy spent in mere individual evangelism, and the preaching of a Gospel to the poor that does not even sympathize with their poverty. Industrial schools in which the boys are taught how to build comfortable houses and where the girls are taught how to cook wholesome meals, will, in the end, win more souls for Jesus Christ than the most devoted preaching of a Gospel that disclaims all interest in the common things of life.

And it must be said for the Christian church in the non-Christian world that she has come nearer the ideal of the kingdom of God than the church in the home lands. The most devoted, self-sacrificing, and practical Christian workers of the last century have been our foreign missionaries. Finding themselves in the midst of appalling poverty, ignorance, and misery, many of them, from the earliest times, and often against the wishes and instructions of the church that sent them, ministered to the

[1] See Essay on the prevailing method in the evangelization of the non-Christian World, by Robert Needham Cust.

bodies of the people as well as to their souls. They tried to make their life more livable here on earth, as well as inspire them with the hope of bliss in heaven. From the very beginning many of the foreign missionaries rendered a real Christian social service. They tried to redeem Oriental society as well as make converts to the church. The reaction of foreign missions on the church at home has been a potent factor in the awakening of the church to her larger duty.

No one is able to estimate the apologetic value of the 1616 hospitals and medical dispensaries, which are treating 5,000,000 patients a year; the 111 medical schools; the 98 schools for nurses; the 25 institutions for the blind and for deaf mutes; the 88 leper hospitals and asylums; the 21 homes for the untainted children of lepers; and the 21 homes for fallen and diseased women, all of which are superintended by alien missionaries and equipped and maintained by foreign money. In many of the 86 colleges and universities, and in the majority of the 1714 boarding schools and high schools, equipped and maintained by Christian finance, some kind of industrial training is given. Many of the mission stations in the non-Christian world are being conducted on an industrial basis. Of the 136 missionary societies operating in India at the present time, 47 offer industrial training along with their more specific religious work. At the same time that the missionary teaches men to repent of their sins and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, he teaches them how to plow their ground and to sow their seed, how to breed a better stock of cattle, how to grow healthier children, how to wash their bodies, how to make their clothes, and how to build their houses. And those mission stations that have rendered the best social service [1] have also been most successful in their spiritual ministry. The poor people may not be able to understand the missionary's catechism, but they will believe in

[1] For example that at Allahabad, India.

the religion that has the power to break the curse of their physical and social bondage. They will ultimately adopt the religion that makes a real difference in their life.

But we must bear in mind that our physical ministry, like the physical ministrations of Jesus, must aim at the ultimate spiritual regeneration of the people who are ministered unto. The breeding of a better stock of cattle, the building of houses with bath-tubs, and the constructing of streets with sanitary gutters, must not be the end of our foreign missionary efforts, but merely a means to the culture of healthier bodies and nobler souls. However, that the humanitarian work of the industrial missions has not materialized Christianity, nor in the least militated against its effectiveness on Christian conduct, is proved by the splendid type of native Christian that has been produced in these stations. In the genuineness of their repentance, in their devotion to their Lord and Master, their church and their Bible; in the sacrifices they make for the religion of their adoption, and in the liberality in the support of their church, many of them compare very favorably with the best of our Christians here at home. They love the religion that has served them. We need not fear to give further trial to the practical ministry that has produced such results.

A religion that answers the needs of life, as primitive Christianity did in the Roman empire, is the first essential of success in foreign missions.

Foreign Missions must be reinforced by the Christian Civilization in the Home-Land.—Another thing is necessary, imperatively necessary. Foreign missions must be reinforced by our Christian civilization here at home. We must support our missionaries not only by our prayers and our offerings, but also by the life we live here in America. The impact of our Western civilization on the Orient will be the ultimate factor in determining the fate of Christianity in the non-Christian world.

Up to this time Western civilization has failed to give adequate support to the struggling Christian church in the Orient. In many instances Western commerce has created an anti-Christian sentiment in the Orient, and has left a retarding influence on the work of Christian missions. Our commerce, which is carried on primarily for the sake of profit for private parties, or in the selfish interest of some nominally Christian nation, has been trafficking in the bodies and the souls of the helpless people whom the missionaries are trying to save. One of the most pathetic appeals I ever listened to was made by the veteran John G. Paton for public sentiment in this country against the unchristian commerce of the Western nations among the helpless people for whom he was at the time giving his life. John R. Mott, the great Christian statesman, said not long ago: "With truth it must be said that the Christian nations are responsible for the drugging of China with opium, and for debauching Africa with alcohol." It can be asserted on the best of authority that certain British business interests are responsible for keeping great multitudes of India's people in poverty.[1] The newspapers have reported that certain moneyed interests in the United States are making strenuous efforts to transfer to China the saloon which we have outlawed here. For the sake of profit, many of our Christian business men here at home, some of them very likely members of congregations that give liberally to foreign missions, are destroying the bodies and souls of the people whom the missionaries are supposed to save. For the sake of profit, our American business men have sent into the remotest corners of the earth, beer, whiskey, opium, cigarettes, the munitions of war, and many other commodities that undermine the health and the morality of the people. Wherever there has been an opportunity our Western business has been exploiting the Oriental

[1] See F. B. Fisher, "India's Silent Revolution," pp. 35-37, 56; also Herbert Adams Gibbons, "The New Map of Asia," p. 55.

people just as it does us here at home. Many of the Orientals are beginning to see this. They see that we who are sending them missionaries have failed to christianize our business here at home; and some of them ask in what sense our religion is better than theirs.

It is only as our commerce will become more thoroughly christianized and thus made a means of service for all the people, instead of a means of profit for a few, that it will become a help instead of a hindrance to Christian missions. The christianizing of our business here at home will be one of the most potent factors in the evangelizing and the christianizing of the non-Christian world. If we fail to christianize our business here at home all our foreign missionary efforts may in the end be a wasted effort.

Another retarding influence on foreign missions is the unchristian conduct of many of the Western men and women who sojourn in the Orient. Western government officials, business men, American and European tourists and pleasure seekers, usually outnumber the missionaries in the larger cities, especially in the sea-port towns. The conduct of these people is often anything but Christian. But because they come from the countries of the missionaries they are classed as Christians. They mould public sentiment toward Christianity as much as the missionaries themselves. A very prominent missionary, speaking of the conduct of this type of foreigner, says: "It is a stumbling block to the humble minded convert. It shakes his faith to see his white brothers from Christian lands openly do the things which the Bible and the missionaries exhort him not to do,—swear, drink, gamble, profane the Sabbath. It brings upon him a storm of reproach from his neighbors and friends who revile him for being associated with Christians. No other temptation, or difficulty, is so grievous to him as this." Missionaries tell us that they are constantly asked by their converts why their fellow Americans, who are visiting in the Oriental

cities, do not go to church on Sundays as the native Christians are told to do. It is a sad thing for the missionary to see his work so seriously crippled by the people from his own country.

During the last decade or two the East has been coming into direct touch with our Western civilization through an ever increasing number of its own people who come to live with us for a while, and who see deeper into our life, and understand us better, than we seem to appreciate. One class of Orientals in particular who are getting to know us right well are the many students, the brightest and most promising of their young people, who live with us for a few years and observe the fruits of our Christian civilization at close range. They get their conception of Christianity on its home soil, where it has been tested for centuries. Some of them go back home the friends of Christianity, while others go back never to have anything to do with the Christian religion. In many cases, perhaps in the majority of cases, our great educational institutions, and our Christian communities, have failed to create a pro-Christian sentiment in these young people, who go back to their respective countries and immediately assume leadership among their own people in almost every walk of life,—in law, medicine, politics, business,—in practically everything but Christianity. Their long sojourn in a Christian country and among Christian people has gone to waste so far as the work of foreign missions is concerned.

The Vice-Mayor of Tokio, who is a member of the Christian church of Japan, during his recent visit to the United States, said that the most serious obstacle to Christianity in Japan is the fact that the Japanese people are beginning to know America. That is a serious indictment. "The young people of my country," he said, "cannot help seeing that Christians in America care most about material things, not about the things of the spirit; that there is very little reverence here, and many evil

conditions. This leads them to wonder if Christianity is really as good as the missionaries say." The more intelligent people of the Orient see that we have failed to solve the problems of poverty, of vice, of caste, of women and child labor, of intemperance, of materialism, and of many other individual and social evils. This lack of influence which the Christian religion has had on our social life very forcibly counteracts anything that the poor missionary may say in favor of the religion which he represents. If the affiliation of the Oriental students with our Christian educational institutions, and if several years of residence in a Christian community, will not convert them to Christianity, there is very little that the lone missionary can hope to accomplish with them or through them.

As a proof of the practical efficiency of the religion which he represents the foreign missionary should be able to point his audience to results in the home land, where Christianity has been thoroughly tested. But in too many instances he may not do this; for, as the Vice-Mayor of Tokio has said, his audience is beginning to know us too well. The social inefficiency of the Christian church here at home is beginning to condemn us before the heathen, and is taking the wind out of the sails of the foreign missionary.

Since the great war began in 1914, in which all the foremost Christian nations were engaged in murderous combat, the question has been debated: what will be the effect of this catastrophe on the attitude of the non-Christian people toward the Christian religion? We rejoice over the optimistic reports that have been coming to us from many of the missionaries themselves, and from such eminent authorities as John R. Mott, and others prominently connected with the work of foreign missions. They have informed us that this appalling calamity has not seriously affected the cause of foreign missions,—that the financial end of the work has not been crippled

in spite of the frightful cost of the war,—that the evangelistic work has moved on uninterruptedly and with the usual number of converts,—and, best of all, that the non-Christian people see that the fault is with a certain pagan element in our civilization, and that the war, with its frightful violations of all the rules of civilized life, is in no way to be charged to the shortcomings of the Christian religion.

We hope that this optimism is well founded. But we have our doubts. It seems to be impossible that such a colossal calamity like this war,—that such an appalling destruction of human life by Christian people,—that the implacable hate that has been manifested by the Christian nations and their people toward each other, should not have a sinister effect upon the attitude of the non-Christian people toward the Christian religion. It does not seem possible that the Oriental people should not in some way associate this murderous hatred of the Christian people toward each other with certain short-comings of Christianity itself. Why should not Christianity, after all these years, have had a more wholesome effect upon the life of the Christian nations? Why has the Christian religion, which the missionaries have claimed to be the sure cure for all ills, not cured the ills of the nations from which the missionaries come? The non-Christian people can hardly help feeling that there is something wrong with the Christianity which we represent.

That there are some of them who feel that way about the matter is certain. In speaking of the world war, Count Okumi, one of the keenest minds in Japan, said: "Perhaps the missionaries will not be so sure now that they have something better to offer than we have." I fear that he expressed the sentiment of many of his fellow citizens in Japan, and of men elsewhere in the non-Christian world. And I cannot blame them. If I were a citizen of Japan or China I should hesitate, I should consider seriously, at a time like this, before renouncing

my own religion and courting ridicule and persecution for a religion that has seemingly had so little effect upon the nations from which the missionaries come. I fear that I should postpone the great decision until the atmosphere had cleared a little. The pity of it is all the greater because this calamity came when the doors of opportunity were opening everywhere.

To sum up then: To evangelize the non-Christian world we must continue to send missionaries and money until a native Christian church has been established and trained to carry the work to completion. To accomplish this the Christian religion must prove its practical superiority over the religions which it seeks to dispossess. And, finally, the work of Christian missions in the non-Christian lands must be reinforced by our Christian civilization in the home-lands. The ultimate fate of the Christian religion in the Orient will not depend so much upon the number and the enthusiasm of our missionaries as upon the type of Christian civilization that we will develop here at home. No religion that is powerless to prevent war, to eradicate poverty, and to secure justice, will ever dominate the world. In other words: no religion but the one that is implied in the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God will ever become the religion of the whole human race.

III

THE EVANGELISTIC PROBLEMS IN THE HOME LAND

The Weakness of Our Regular Methods of Evangelism.—I do not wish to be understood as blaming the church unduly for her failure to recruit the majority of the people of the country, much less for the prevailing indifference to the things of God. The evangelistic task is a difficult one. We cannot hope, by any methods that we may use, to enlist all the people. In every large community there are many people who cannot be interested

SCHOOL OF THEOLOG

in the things that are good and clean and holy. There is still more animal than God in the average man. Moral evolution is still in its infancy as compared with physical evolution. Selfishness and material interests are still the determining factors in the average man's conduct.

And in the average community there is still very much to tempt this all-too-temptable human nature. The pathway of the people is strewn with grievous stumbling blocks. The atmosphere in which they work and seek their recreation is tainted with a semi-pagan kind of commercialism which is constantly tempting them away from the things which the church has to offer. Any one who knows human nature, and who understands the spirit of the age, knows that there is very serious work ahead for the church. With the rapid spread of materialism, the constant multiplication of automobiles and moving picture houses, and the opening of Sunday to many kinds of business and to all kinds of amusement and dissipation, the church will have a serious time to maintain herself and her influence in the world. Her work was never more difficult than right now.

But while all this is true, we must also confess that the church has hitherto made no adequate effort to reach the unchurched element in our communities. Our evangelistic efforts, during the last century, did not reach out beyond the church's own constituency. Our annual increase in membership has been made up almost entirely from the families of the church. We have been going through the ritual from Sunday to Sunday, and have preached a soothing Gospel to the pious souls who have cared to come to hear us, but we have not gone out after those who have not been coming of their own accord. Unlike the faithful shepherd in the Parable of the Lost Sheep, we have been nurturing those who have remained in the fold, but have neglected those who have strayed away. We have been at ease in Zion.

In preparation for this study I examined the records

of a number of representative city churches and found that for a period of four years 98.7% of their increase was made up of confirmations of baptized children of the congregation, of people received by letter from other churches, and of delinquent members reinstated. Only 1.3% of the total increase in the membership of these influential churches, from 1915 to 1919, was from that element in the community which had been unaffiliated with the church before. The pastor of a country charge, who made a similar examination of the records of some twenty representative town and country charges, found that less than 2% of the increase, for a period of six years, was from the unchurched element in the community. Even Home Missions, until quite recently, were a means of conserving the constituency of the denomination, rather than an organized effort to evangelize the community. We usually organized our new missions around a nucleus of people trained in our catechism, or baptized according to our view of the rite, while we left the unchurched to their choice. The different sects competed with each other for their individual existence rather than coöperated with one another to evangelize the community.

But what can we do? How can we recruit more of the unchurched people of our communities? And how can we interest them and hold them after we have recruited them?

An Important Move.—The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, recognizing the need of coöperative evangelism, has recommended, through its Commission on Evangelism, that the local churches cooperate in a systematic effort to interest the people of the community in the church and the things of the kingdom of God. The Commission recommends that a committee of representative local men be appointed to superintend the campaign. A series of subjects of an evangelistic nature is suggested for discussion from the local

pulpits at the same hour each Lord's day, for a period of five or six weeks. Special meetings for the inspiration and guidance of the pastors are held. Public meetings and shop meetings are held to get the community awakened and interested. A publicity committee keeps the matter constantly before the public through newspaper articles, posters, buttons, etc. A large committee, representing all the churches, is appointed to take a religious census of the city. After the problems of evangelism have been discussed for a time from all the pulpits and through the public press, a house-to-house canvass is made, and the information thus gathered is tabulated and carefully studied. People not belonging to any church in the city, but expressing a preference for a certain church, are immediately referred to the pastor and the group of workers of that church. People belonging to a particular denomination but not affiliated with that denomination in the city, and expressing no preference of pastor or congregation, are referred to the pastor of that denomination in whose territory they happen to reside. And those affiliated with no church at all are kept for the final "follow-up work," which marks the culmination of the campaign. A carefully selected group of men, representing all the congregations, and instructed beforehand by "a specialist in soul-winning," will follow up these people and through personal efforts will endeavor to win them for the church and the kingdom of God. This general plan, adapted to local conditions, is to be repeated from season to season.

Our Federation of Churches tried out this plan during Lent, 1919. The plan puts the responsibility for the evangelization of the community upon the local congregations, where it belongs. The churches of the community must not shift their responsibility upon a stranger—a professional evangelist— who comes and goes, and who may be more concerned about the donation which he carries away than he is about the constructive

community results which he leaves behind. Something was gained by getting the churches to undertake the task together. Some valuable information was gathered. The conclusions of Professor Bossard as to the grip the Protestant church of our city has on the population was confirmed by the information that was gathered in this canvass. But in the matter of additions to the churches the experiment was a keen disappointment to many. Very few, if any, of the unchurched were enlisted. Our special efforts created scarcely a ripple of interest among the unchurched, especially among those who have become antagonistic to the church.

Personally I was not disappointed at the practical failure of our experiment. We cannot hope to win large accessions to the church by a single campaign, no matter how it is conducted. It will take a number of such campaigns to awaken, first of all, our drowsy congregations, to say nothing of arousing our apathetic communities. And after all, it is not so much a matter of method, as of spirit,—not so much a matter of a program as of the content of the program. We cannot hope for any permanent results, even through such coöperative efforts as those recommended by the Federal Council's Commission on Evangelism, unless it is our purpose to establish the kingdom of God rather than to build up the church. The Federal Council's plan is a good one, but it will require the spirit of the kingdom of God to make it effective.

The Supreme Need of Evangelism.—The supreme need in evangelism, as in everything else, is the return of the church in both her theology and her practice to the full program which the kingdom of God has entrusted to her. The religion of the kingdom of God, as we saw in the first chapter, contains a message that throbs with genuine sympathy with everything that is human. No section of our life lies outside of the scope of its interest.

Its ultimate purpose is to give "the abundant life"—physical, mental, and spiritual life—to every citizen of the community, and to every individual of the human race. Its ministry includes the regeneration of the community as well as the salvation of the individual. It takes an interest in the schools, the dwelling houses, the playhouses, the parks, and the streets of the community, as well as in its churches. To inspire this kingdom-vision in the class room of the theological seminary, and to carry out this kingdom-program in our denominational and congregational activities, and in our every day life as members of the church and as citizens of the commonwealth, is the only kind of evangelism that will meet with permanent success in our day. In fact the only type of evangelism that ever secured permanently desirable results was that which was animated by the spirit and purpose of the kingdom of God.

The evangelistic success of Jesus was largely due to the genuinely human element in his message and ministry. In the opening sermon of his Galilean ministry he stated his purpose in a quotation from the social message of Isaiah: ". . . the Spirit of the Lord God is upon me,

> Because he anointed me to preach good tidings
> to the poor;
> And sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
> And recovering of sight to the blind,
> To set at liberty them that are bruised.
> To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." [1]

The faithful carrying out of this divine-human program was the only kind of evangelism that Jesus attempted. He had a heart that was full of human sympathy, and a message that was full of human interest. He preached "the good tidings" of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man in simple, human language. And what he preached in the church, he lived in the com-

[1] Luke 4: 18-19.

munity. He relieved the distressed and healed the sick. He clothed the naked and fed the hungry. He was a big brother to the poor and the outcast. His message and his ministry touched life at every point.

And there was a ready response to Jesus' ministry of sympathy and of practical helpfulness. "The common people heard him gladly." They followed him in crowds, not only to banquet on his loaves and fishes, or out of mere curiosity, but also because they instinctively felt that he was a true friend, and that his purpose was to serve them. Jesus won the heart of the common people wherever he came into touch with them. His popularity with the masses protected him for a whole year against the violence of his powerful enemies. Professor Rauschenbusch says: "His midnight arrest, his hasty trial, and the anxious efforts to work on the feelings of the crowd are all tributes to his good standing with the common people." [1] There is no doubt that Jesus would have been eminently successful in his evangelistic efforts with the masses of Palestine if the religious and the political authorities had not interfered. In spite of the organized opposition to him, he created sufficient faith in his Gospel and loyalty to himself in two brief years to withstand all future efforts to destroy his influence. That was successful evangelism. But he followed no made-to-order methods. He had no special schemes or clever devices to attract attention to himself, or to create interest in what he had to say. It was the big-brother spirit in Jesus, and the element of service in his religion, that drew the people.

We noticed in the preceding section that it was this same serviceable element in primitive Christianity that won its way into the heart of the Roman empire. And it is my conviction that any religion that answers the needs of life as the religion of Jesus did, and as primitive Christianity did, and as it is the purpose of the religion

[1] "Christianity and The Social Crisis," p. 84.

of the kingdom of God to do, will, in any community and in any age, compel the respect and the support of those people whose character and influence determine the destiny of society. One may well wonder what the influence of organized Christianity would have been in the evolution of society if the fundamental precept of Jesus: that we love one another as he loved us, had continued to be the guiding principle of our daily conduct, instead of having been reverently buried in the liturgy of our Communion Service. There is no question that the evangelistic power of the church would have been much greater if there had not been certain foreign elements in our religious thought and practice which usurped the place of that primitive spirit of good-will which placed every member of the church, with all his possessions, at the service of his fellows. A religion that answers the needs of life has evangelistic power. The people to whom such a religion will not appeal can be discounted in our estimate of the moral and spiritual assets of the community.

The Lack of Evangelistic Appeal in Those Elements of Our Religion which are Foreign to the Prophetic Conception of the Kingdom.—Those elements in our religious life which are foreign to the ideals of the kingdom of God have been harmful in two directions. On the one hand, they have dampened the church's zeal for social righteousness, and on the other hand, they have destroyed her power to appeal to that influential element in modern society which is interested in social righteousness. There are three things in particular that have occupied a very prominent place in organized Christianity for nineteen centuries and which no amount of enthusiasm can make appeal to the representative men and women of our day, no matter how much they may have appealed to the people of an earlier day.

Prominent among the influences in side-tracking the Christian church from the reconstructive social pro-

gram which is implied in the principles of the kingdom of God was the spirit of *other-worldism,* which may have had its origin in something that Jesus himself had said, or in a misunderstanding of something that he had said; or it may have found its way into primitive Christianity through the Apocalyptic-Jewish influence which was quite potent in the Apostolic circle. But no matter what the source of it was, the conspicuous place which this unsocial spirit has held in the thought and life of the church, from that day to this, has, on the one hand, destroyed her passion for social regeneration, and, on the other, her power to enlist the support and compel the respect of the most influential and powerful elements in society today. Before Christianity had become two decades old the idea of the speedy return of the Lord to destroy the earth diverted the attention of the church from social salvation to individual bliss in heaven.

Under the dominance of the Greek influence the very content of the Christian Gospel became other-worldly. Jesus Christ became essentially a redeemer from earthliness. His supreme gift was that of immortality. By baptism the germ of the immortal life was implanted, and by the Holy Communion it was nurtured. The eucharist was called "the medicine of immortality." The other-world conception of religion came to a climax in Augustine's "City of God." For nine years prior to his conversion to Christianity Augustine had been "a hearer" of the Manichæan sect, and his "City of God," which has exerted a greater influence on Christian theology than the Gospels, clearly shows the marks of his earlier Manichæan associations. Manichæism was saturated with Greek dualism, and with the Greek contempt for matter as the seat of all corruption and evil. This unsocial view of life was immortalized in Augustine's "City of God." The city of the world, conceived as the city of Satan, exists side by side with the City of God through all history. The citizens of the kingdom are declared to be only pilgrims

in the city of the world, escaping from it at death, but not at all concerned about winning this present evil world for God. The church and the religion which it represented lost all vital contact with the world that was so sadly in need of salvation. The church of the Middle Ages was completely dominated by these dualistic-other-world conceptions. This unsocial spirit came to ripe fruitage in asceticism and monasticism. The saint's chief duty was to keep himself unspotted from the world, which he tried to accomplish by getting out of the world and burying himself in a cloister in the mountains, while the devil was left free to manage his big worldly domain.

Protestantism failed to save Christianity from the dwarfing influence of other-worldism. The Sixteenth Century Reformation was primarily an ecclesiastical reformation. Whatever social reformation followed from the movement came as a by-product. It was not the intention that society should be reformed, or that the reformed church should become an instrument of social regeneration. The church continued to be conceived of as an ark of safety rather than an instrument of social regeneration. Her chief duty was to get her members safely out of this evil world into the other world. The purpose of religion was to prepare men to die peacefully, rather than help them to live justly and righteously. This other-world spirit animates the major portion of our liturgy, the majority of our hymns, and a great part of our theology even today. Under the narcotic influence of this unsocial theology the Protestant church, like the Catholic church, has been more concerned about increasing the population of heaven than about regenerating the earth.

Since the world war, premilennarianism has been spreading over Europe and America with surprising success. We were amazed last spring to learn that the premillenarian influence was strong enough to divide the sentiment and the vote of one of the greatest and most

influential Protestant denominations on one of the most vital questions that has confronted the church for a century. Another one of our great denominations fears a possible disruption through this influence which has entrenched itself within its bounds. While all good and sensible men should coöperate in rebuilding society in accordance with the kingdom-principles of brotherhood and justice, millions of Christians are complacently waiting for the Lord to come and destroy this hopelessly evil world. Not only do they, as Christians, refuse to join in any social service movements or programs, but they strenuously insist that the church must not engage in any such efforts.

Whatever drawing power this type of religion may have had in other ages, it is clear to any one who understands the spirit of our age, that it can no longer be made to appeal to the representative men and women of our respective communities. Great choruses augumented by brass bands, enthusiastic prayer-meetings, and coöperative evangelistic campaigns, will all alike fail to drive this type of religion home to the ear and the heart of our age. It fails to appeal to the ever-increasing host of social-minded men and women, who are endeavoring, by rational methods, to make this old world a healthier, happier, and better place in which to live. We cannot hope to interest these people in an institution that has more to say about "mansions in the skies" than about uninhabitable tenements and flats on earth. They will not affiliate themselves with an institution whose program includes only that segment of life that lies beyond the unexplored horizon. And, what is just as bad from the social point of view, those people who will be drawn into the church by this type of Gospel, whether they be few or many, will not be fitted for the stern social duties which the kingdom of God implies.

Another thing that has destroyed the church's power to appeal to large and influential classes of modern men

and women is the dogmatizing spirit in theology with its tendency toward fixedness. Christianity began as a simple Gospel of brotherly love declared in simple, human language. It was like a spring garden fresh with life, rather than an herbarium of dried definitions. But unfortunately after the doctrinal controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries, Christianity began to go to seed in dogmas. The essence of Christianity was summed up in things that had to be believed, rather than in a life that had to be lived. The opening words of the Athanasian Creed state: "Whoever would be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholic faith; which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly." This catholic faith is then set forth in a number of incomprehensible declarations on the relation between the persons of the Godhead. For centuries the ablest intellects of the church devoted their time and energy to the formulation and defense of dogmas, many of which, as Professor Rudolph Eucken has said, "are neither rooted in the Gospels, nor related to life."

Intellectually the Protestant Reformation was an attempt to get back of the decrees of popes and councils to the living roots of the Christian religion. But Protestantism again made creedal faith rather than duty to one's neighbor the test of orthodoxy. All of the great Protestant Confessions made creedal faith the supreme requirement. What a man believed concerning certain mysteries was of more religious significance in the early Protestant circles than the way he conducted his business or the way he behaved himself in politics. The fundamental requirement for membership in the Protestant church today is faith in certain doctrines,—mental assent to certain definitions of the Trinity, of revelation and inspiration, of sin and salvation, of the church and the sacraments. The heroic spirit of Protestantism, which defied the pope and his hierarchy, and demanded the right to do its own

thinking, has again been sealed up in its own creeds and dogmas which succeeding generations have had to accept without the right to question or to investigate for themselves.

This is no protest against creeds, much less against theology. It is only a protest against fixedness in our theologizing, and against the right to question what has thus become fixed. By investing her creeds with the augustness of infallibility, the church has been discouraging original thinking. In this way one generation has been putting mental shackles upon succeeding generations, which is an evil that we may not tolerate, whether it is done in the name of religion or in any other name. In this way, too, suceeding generations have been denied the right to check off the errors of past generations. In our practical life we do not despise theory; but our theories must be confirmed by practice, or we will give them up as false. If our theory for the construction of a railroad curve results in the ditching of the trains, we will revise our theory. And we should not do otherwise in our religious practice. The practical, or moral test of a creed is: does it work? Have our creeds resulted in the establishing of the kingdom of God on earth? Have they resulted in the practice of the kingdom-ideals and principles in our social relationships? If they have not, they are, to that extent at least, not true, and should be exchanged for creeds and theories that will bring the kingdom.

In the degree that the church stopped growing intellectually, and that she ceased to adapt her message and her ministry to the growing, changing order of things, she lost her power to appeal to the growing men and women of our modern world. We cannot expect men and women who are grounded in the scientific and social conceptions of the twentieth century to be drawn by an institution whose fundamental conceptions became fossilized centuries ago, and the infallibility of which may not be

questioned. The church's obstinate holding to obsolete views and worn-out creeds has resulted in the loss of multitudes of scientifically and philosophically trained people. Men of the modern spirit cannot be interested in an archaic theology. In this way the church, as we had occasion to observe in another connection, has been losing her grip on the intellectual leaders of our age. The constructive minds of today are not interested either in the church's theology or in her program of salvation. Each year a small army of our brightest young people are educated out of the church, or into indifference to the religion which the church represents. And the fault is not any more that of a Godless system of education than it is that of a static system of theology. I am convinced that many good people who have lost interest in an archaic theology would give their support to the human religion and the practical programme of the kingdom of God. The people who cannot be interested in the theology and the ministry of the kingdom of God can safely be discounted in an inventory of the moral assets of the community. No matter how numerous they may be, they are not the kind of persons whose influence will count for much in the shaping and determining of the policy of the new age.

A third thing that has been destroying the church's evangelistic power in our modern world is the continued over-emphasizing of *ecclesiasticism* or *churchism*. Christianity began as a simple brotherhood; and the church was called into being to perpetuate this brotherhood. But quite early in its history Christianity became identified with churchianity. As soon as the church came into possession of great wealth and power, she began to develop an elaborate system of ecclesiastical machinery. She began to dissipate her life keeping her machinery running. She held services, rather than rendered service. She substituted her own program for the program of the kingdom. She became an end to be served, rather than a means of service. The Catholic communi-

ties were drained of their resources to serve the church, while the church made no effort to return an equivalent in service. More money was spent for ecclesiastical paraphernalia than for constructive welfare work. In the best days of Spain the church spent more money for the candles on her alters than she spent for education. No wonder that Spain collapsed from an internal decay; and no wonder that the Spanish church is a dead issue.

In times of universal ignorance and superstition, and when the church possessed unlimited power, she could command allegiance to herself. The people had to heed her wishes whether they wanted to or not. But that day is past. The only way that the church can command respect and support in our day is through the service that she renders. She must convince the people that she is not merely holding services, but that she is really rendering service, or she will lose them. In his recent books: "In the Shadow of the Cathedral" and "The Fruit of the Vine," Blasco Ibanez, with the insight of the social philosopher and with the charm of the literary genius, has shown us the superb mass of wonderful architecture reared by churchly piety in Spain, and also the subterranean fires of social discontent which are, at this very hour, undermining it all. And not only in the country of Ibanez, but all over Europe, the people are deserting the institution that has been holding costly services that have not served.

Many of our Protestant congregations in our own country are spending too much money and energy in holding services which really do not serve. Like the Jewish church in the days of the prophets and Jesus, and like the Catholic church during the Middle Ages, we are still over-emphasizing the secondary matters of the religious program, while we slight the fundamentals. We are still exalting the holding of services above the rendering of service. The Scriptural injunction "to worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness" no doubt implies a beauti-

ful church building and a dignified church service. But I believe that we fulfill the spirit of this injunction better by giving the poor of our respective communities more habitable dwelling houses and cleaner streets than we do by holding beautiful services in costly church buildings to which the really needy people will not come, and in which they would not be welcome if they did come. In every great city in our country we can find magnificent church buildings in which costly services are being held within sight and sound of the uninhabitable quarters of the poor, whose miserable conditions have not been affected in the least by these religious services. In not a few cases much of the revenue to run the ecclesiastical machinery comes from rents on tenements, and from mortgages on slum properties. Multitudes of social-spirited people are repelled, rather than attracted, by an institution that spends so much money and energy in holding services which do not seem to render any real service.

It is my conviction that the church's departure, in both her theology and her practice, from the divine-human program of the kingdom of God, is the chief cause of her waning power and influence over the intellectual and the social leaders of our day. In the degree that the emphasis has been shifted from this real world to the world that is to come; and from love to our neighbor to speculations about incomprehensible things; and from the church as a means of service to an institution that holds services, the church has sacrificed her power to appeal to the representative men and women of the modern world. Until the church will return to the doctrine and the ministry of the kingdom of God, all her special efforts and her clever schemes to regain her lost ground will avail her but little.

The Case of the Church and the Industrial Laborers.— It is in her relation to the great class of wage-earners, especially the organized industrial laborers, that the

church faces her most serious evangelistic problem. It is here that her waning influence during the last few decades has been most evident. And the trouble is not so much the growing materialism and irreligion of the workers, as a well defined grievance which they have against the church.

In its mildest form the workers' charge against the church is that she has always been indifferent, either ignorantly or wilfully, to those economic and industrial affairs which are so vital to them. They charge her with having busied herself with trifling matters, while she has been indifferent to the things which involve the life or death of their class. They charge her with having strained at the gnats in our social life, while she swallowed the camel of industrial iniquity.

And there is an element of truth in their charges. The church has vigorously condemned such things as card-playing, dancing, and theater-going, while only here and there has a timid voice been raised in protest against the unjust distribution of the conjointly produced wealth of the average community, which makes it possible for a few to revel in extravagance and luxury, while multitudes lack the bare necessities of life. It has not been an unusual thing to hear influential preachers and theological professors deny that the church has anything to do with such "secular things" as work and wages. The very things that mean the life or death of the workers have been declared to be outside of the sphere of the church's thought and activity. A sermon on the proper mode of baptism (i. e., whether the water should be applied to the head or the feet, or whether the subject should be dipped under the water or the water be sprinkled on his head) is a very proper theme for a Sabbath discourse. I have heard a number of very eloquent sermons on this subject in my time. But to speak of a living wage, or an eight hour day, or the need of steady employment, is dragging "worldly themes" into the pulpit.

During a sharp economic crisis in England a short

time before the war, when many thousands of people were out of employment for a long time, Mr. Kier Hardee, one of England's noted labor leaders, appealed to one of the Anglican bishops for advice and help. But the bishop replied that he worked seventeen hours a day and had no time for such problems as unemployment, to which Mr. Hardee retorted: that an institution that requires seventeen hours a day for organization, and leaves no time for a single thought about starving and despairing men and women and children, has no message for our age. The socialist was right and the bishop was wrong. The church dare not, on peril of her own soul, continue to slight the problems of work and wages around which so much of our individual and social life revolves. It is not difficult to see why an institution that spends seventeen hours a day running ecclesiastical machinery, while it confesses itself to be unconcerned about the most fundamental things in the life of the majority of the people, loses its good standing in the community.

Among the more radical groups of industrial workers the grievance against the church has become more acute. They charge her not only with having been indifferent to social and industrial unrighteousness, but with having deliberately played into the hands of the exploiting classes. They feel that the church, from the days of feudal serfdom on down to our own day of capitalistic autocracy, has favored the party that has had the money and the influence to support her. They claim that where the church has understood the conditions and has sympathized with the workers, she has lacked the moral courage to stand for her convictions.

In an address at a recent meeting of industrial workers, I tried to show them the just and righteous social order that is implied in the Christian conception of the kingdom of God, and that the mission of the church is to help us realize these social ideals. In the free discussion that followed there was a very general expression of lack of

confidence in the church as a factor in social regeneration. In answer to the damaging charges that were made against the church by some of the radicals, I referred to the social creed of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and to the liberal attitude of the Industrial Relations Department of the Inter-Church World Movement. But they replied that the Federal Council and the Industrial Relations Department of the Inter-Church Movement represent only the sentiment of a few socially-minded individuals who are not directly responsible to any congregation or denomination. They claimed that the average preacher who has wealthy members is afraid to preach the Gospel of Jesus with all its social implications. The leader in the discussion, an exceptionally well-informed man, said that the experience of labor leaders in this country and in Europe was to find the churches either silent, or else the spokesmen of the capitalists. This is the prevailing feeling in labor circles.

It is what the local churches do in actual situations, rather than the resolutions that are passed by councils and committees, that determines the attitude of the laboring men. At the meeting just referred to I was reminded of the attitude of the churches of my own community in the strike at the Bethlehem Steel Mills, in 1910, something that I had almost forgotten, but which they remembered with much bitterness. As they explained the case, and as I remember the facts, one of the issues of the strike was the demand for release from Sunday work, a thing for which the church has always stood, at least theoretically. A committee composed of Dr. Charles Stelzle, Dr. Josiah Strong, and Paul U. Kellogg, representing the Social Service Commission of the Federal Council of Churches, came to Bethlehem and investigated the conditions. Their report was, on the whole, favorable to the strikers. And I have personal reasons to believe that the majority of the ministers of Bethlehem and of South Bethlehem were in sympathy with the strikers, many of

whom, as the report of the Federal Bureau of Labor shows, were working seven days of the week and for shamefully low wages.[1] But the Industrial Commission of Bethlehem, composed of prominent business and professional men, some of them very likely leaders in the church life of the city, passed a resolution condemning the strikers and extolling the virtues and the services of the steel corporation. This resolution was followed by another one drawn up by a committee of the Bethlehem Ministerial Association, the committee consisting of the pastors of three congregations which had indirectly been the beneficiaries of the steel company's prosperity. This resolution which, as I was told by a Bethlehem minister, was never submitted to the Ministerial Association for their approval or disapproval, favored the corporation, and was published in the Bethlehem papers as if it represented the sentiment of the clergy of the city. The error was never corrected, and the impression prevails to this day in labor circles throughout the Lehigh Valley that the churches of this community were the spokesmen of Mr. Schwab and his corporation.

In December, 1911, Mr. John A. Fitch published an article, in the *Survey,* on: "The Bethlehem Churches and the Steel Workers," in which he placed Bethlehem and its churches in a very unfavorable light in this crisis. That article by Mr. Fitch, which was very widely read in labor circles, and the two resolutions just referred to, injured the church in the Lehigh Valley more than half a dozen professional evangelists, with their brass bands, or than

[1] The report of the Federal Bureau of Labor, Senate Document No. 521, of the Sixty-First Congress, second session, shows that 2,628 of the 9,291 of the employees were regularly working seven days of the week. During the month prior to the strike 4,041 men worked seven days of the week. The report also declares that 5,618 men, or 61% of the total working force, got only 18¢ an hour, or $2.16 for a twelve hour day, while 31% of the total working force got 14¢ an hour or $1.68 for a twelve hour day. That was in 1910.

half a dozen coöperative evangelistic campaigns, can rectify. The church must be exceedingly careful not to create the impression that, right or wrong, she plays on the side that has the money and the influence to support her.

And there is a third class of industrial laborers whose grievance against the church has taken the form of defiant and systematic opposition. We have not suffered much, as yet, from this extreme attitude of labor here in America; but in Europe, especially in Continental Europe, it is the prevailing attitude. The ultra radicals not only feel that the church has been on the side of the moneyed class for selfish or cowardly reasons, but they contend that the church's program of salvation is, in its very essence, of such a nature as to disqualify her as a factor in the matter of social regeneration. They contend that the church's individualistic conception of salvation, and that her doctrines of future rewards and punishments, unfit her membership for the stern struggle which the regeneration of the industrial order necessarily requires. They feel that faith in the future world and the hope of bliss in heaven have a tendency to keep men content with their undeserved poverty and their unnecessary misery on earth. They feel that the church is, for these reasons, an obstruction in the way of social progress and should be destroyed.

Instead of merely denouncing and abusing the church as the friend of the capitalist, the ultra radicals of Continental Europe and elsewhere, have been opposing a carefully thought-out philosophy of their own against the theology of the church. Just as the ancient Greek philosopher Epicurus tabooed all faith in the gods and the future life in the interest of his hedonistic philosophy, so these extreme social radicals have banished from their social creed every reference to the future life. They do this in the interest of the most positive efforts for social revolution. In certain sections of Europe, and even here in America, the ultra radicals have been systematically teaching their children that there is no God, that there is

no heaven and no hell, that they have no immortal souls, and that there are no such things as future rewards and punishments as taught by the church. They do this, not because they are such wicked infidels at heart, but because they feel that faith in these things will destroy that social passion in men which is so essential in the stern struggle in which they are interested. And no matter what we may think of their philosophy, either from an ethical or from an economic point of view, it is being hailed by many thousands of people with all the passion and the fervor of a new religion. No amount of anathematizing will change the situation in the least. Bulls of excommunication, and the horrors of purgatory or of hell, will not intimidate them at all. Their philosophy makes them as insensible to all kinds of other-world fears or favors as the fabled salamander is to fire.

In Continental Europe, I fear, the case between the church and the masses in general and the industrial laborers in particular is hopeless. The church failed to see the widening chasm that was forming between herself and the people until it was too late to bridge it over. In no part of Soviet Russia has the church retained her hold on the people. In many sections of Russia organized religion has shared the same fate as the Romanoff government whose ally it had been. In the industrial centers of the new Germany as many people have openly renounced the church as still belong to it. And the fault in both of these countries is more that of the church than of the people. The church ceased to serve many years ago, and now she ceases to live. Some one has aptly said that the church, in many sections of Continental Europe, finds herself ditched with punctured tires at the very time when she should lead the way in the reconstruction of the broken down social order. May God save us from the same plight here in America!

Among the English speaking working people, especially in the United States and in Canada, the situation is not

yet hopeless. The irreconcilable anti-church spirit of the European labor movement has not yet seriously affected the average American industrial laborer. The church in America still has a chance to save herself from the plight of the European church if she will seize the opportunity now. The church must not become a partisan in the conflict between capital and labor. What she must do is to teach and practice the ideals and principles of the kingdom of God. She must, without fear or favor, apply the kingdom-principles of brotherhood and service, of justice and fairness, to the problems of industry. As Dr. Charles Stelzle has pointed out, in "The Social Application of Religion," the church must make both parties in the conflict feel that she stands only for so much of the present system as is in accordance with the principles and the motives laid down by Jesus. She must make both parties feel that she is opposed to any part or to any practice of the present system that violates these principles. She must see the truth clearly and declare it fearlessly regardless of which party may be pleased or angered by it. In the faithful ministry of the kingdom lies the church's sole duty and only hope. I am not at all hopeful that any great number of the present generation of estranged workingmen can be won back to the church. But I am confident that many of their children and grand-children can be won if the whole church will attempt to carry out the whole program which the religion of the kingdom of God implies.

I have specially emphasized the case of the church and the laboring people because of its great importance. The industrial laborers are a great and mighty host whom no institution can afford to neglect or alienate. The modern working man is demanding "a place in the sun," and he will get it. The laboring people will be one of the most potent factors in determining the policy and shaping the destiny of the future social order. The institution that fails to hold their confidence and respect will separate itself from one of the most powerful social forces of the

future. In the last public address that I heard Professor Walter Rauschenbusch deliver, he raised the question: "What will it profit the church if she will convert 1,000,000 people in China and Japan, and lose 1,000,000 working people here at home?" The plain fact is that it would profit her nothing at all. The result would have to be expressed by a minus sign. The loss of 1,000,000 working people here in America would cancel the gain from the conversion of 10,000,000 people in any part of the non-Christian world. Nowhere else could the Christian church win 1,000,000 recruits who would mean so much for the kingdom of God in this day of social rebuilding as from among the intelligent English-speaking working people. Here is one of the church's greatest problems. The church needs the working people, and the working people need the church. Society would suffer an irreparable loss if the church and organized labor should become permanently divorced. From a purely selfish point of view, the church could better afford to be divorced from capital than from labor.

Other Unevangelized Classes.—In every large community there are many people who do not belong to any of the classes that have thus far been mentioned, and who cannot be won by the individualistic type of evangelism. There are many who have gone astray not as individual entities, but as members of society; and it is only as society itself is won for the kingdom of God that these individuals can be won. They have gone astray not necessarily because of the innate perversity of their wills, but because they are the victims of a bad environment. They are the victims of poor breeding, bad housing, under-nourishment, and unwholesome amusements. It is difficult in all cases, and in many cases altogether impossible, for men and women born and reared in rooms without proper light and ventilation, in surroundings of filth and squalor, overworked and under-nourished as many of them are, to feel

the appeal of the finer and nobler things of life. Their moral as well as their aesthetic sense is stunted. And the fault is just as much that of society as their own. The only type of evangelism that can ever hope to win this class of people is that which aims at winning the social order itself for God. The only type of evangelism that will have any permanent effect upon the social outcasts is that which takes an interest in everything that concerns the community's life,—not only its churches, but also its schools, its dwelling houses, its markets, its streets, its work, its play, its health, *its everything.*

Professor Clarence A. Beckwith, of the University of Chicago, in his stimulating book: "The Church, the People, and the Age," thus summarizes the church's present task and duty: "Not until it rediscovers in the new social environment and consciously defines and dedicates itself to its task will it compel the allegiance of both its own members and of the people of the community in which it is placed. Its task may be different or simpler in one community than in another—here religious, there educational, elsewhere social, or all of these in various combinations and degrees. Its only justification for existence even lies in the words of Jesus, 'I am in the midst of you as one that serveth.' All over our land are discarded buildings which tell their own tragic tale: because they ceased to serve they ceased to live. Not long will a community care for a church that cares little or nothing for it." [1]

The supreme call of evangelism is the call for a religion that serves—a religion that answers all the needs of the community's life. The church, as an instrument of the kingdom of God, must be in the midst of the community "as one that serves," rather than as one that holds services. If the church will pour out her life that the people of the community may have "the abundant life,"

[1] p. 505.

she will save herself for a mission of everlasting usefulness, even if there will continue to be many selfish and materialistic individuals who cannot be won as members.

Getting the Message to the People.—On the one hand, the evangelism of the kingdom implies a vital message, a message that takes an interest in life; and, on the other hand, it implies adequate ways and means of getting our message into vital touch with the people.

Jesus did more than preach a vital Gospel. He followed up his preaching with persistent personal work with individuals. He did not wait in the Temple, or in some convenient synagogue, for the people to come to him; but he carried his message after them. The people followed Jesus, but he also followed the people. In his brief ministry, aided by no conveniences for travel, he came into close personal touch with many people from the Lebanon Mountains to Jerusalem, and from the Mediterranean Sea to Perea. A number of these people were set on fire by the plain evangelist from Nazareth. And it was accomplished by the preaching of a vital Gospel, and through systematic personal work with individuals.

His last command to his disciples was that they should go and do as he had done. They were to preach his Gospel and to continue his practical work among the people. And that is what they did. Their preaching may not always have had the vital ring in it that the Master's had; but what they lacked in preaching ability, they made up through their persistent personal work with individuals. Like Jesus they carried their message after the people. They spoke religion to the people in their homes and on the streets, in the market places where they came to do their business, and on the river banks where they met for recreation and prayer. That little band of Christian disciples planted congregations in the most important communities of the known world before the last one of

them was dead. And the secret of it was a vital Gospel, plus the personal work of consecrated individuals with individuals.

Modern business has adopted similar methods. A live business concern will not manufacture a good article, and then wait for willing purchasers; but it will carry the goods after the people, and will make an effort to solicit their interest. A few years ago, for example, a manufacturing concern in one of our large cities made a simple article of food called "corn flakes." The firm did not build a number of fine store houses at convenient places to display their goods, and then waited for trade. On the contrary, they launched a systematic and comprehensive advertising campaign. Not only did every newspaper and magazine in the country contain the good news of the notable discovery in the world of eatables, but every door bell in every city and town throughout the country was rung, and every house-wife was given a sample of corn flakes. The result was almost miraculous. All of us simultaneously began to eat corn flakes for breakfast. It was not because of the magic virtue of corn flakes, but because of the scientific way of getting the article before the people. Advertising and salesmanship have become both a science and an art. Special schools have been established for the purpose of training men to advertise and to sell goods. Some of our foremost universities have recently added special departments in scientific advertising and salesmanship. The phenomenal success of certain lines of big business and scientific advertising and salesmanship have gone hand in hand.

Jesus, on one occasion, said that "the sons of this earth are for their generation wiser than the children of light." Modern business has certainly been wiser in devising ways and means of getting its goods before the people than the church has been. The church has made very little effort to get her goods before those people who do not come to her of their own accord. It is only in rare cases that any-

thing like scientific advertising has been attempted by the church. As a rule church advertising has been opposed by the hyper-churchly element as an undignified, worldly innovation. They tell us that the church must not compromise with the ways of the world; that she must depend for success upon the dignity of her spiritual appeal. We believe in the dignity of the church's appeal; but we also know that the prolonged resting on her dignity is putting her out of business. There is a business side as well as a spiritual side to our church work. If the church really feels that she has the spiritual goods that the world needs, she must not hesitate to make a careful study of the best ways and means of getting her goods before the people. By confining ourselves to the preaching of the Gospel in our churches on Sundays, as has been our custom for many years, we are not reaching the number of people we should reach, nor can we hope in this way to reach the class of people whom we ought to reach.

There is imperative need, first of all, for organized and well directed personal work among the membership of the local congregation. The majority of Protestant congregations of average size are out of touch with their own people. We noticed, in the first section of this chapter, that the Protestant churches of the average American community come into weekly touch with only about 20% of their own membership. We come into weekly touch with less than half of the children enrolled in our Sunday Schools. It is clear that we must mobilize and vitalize the forces that we have already recruited before we can carry out any aggressive program of community evangelization or of world evangelization. An army that can rally only 20% of its soldiers to the mess table and to the daily drill is defeated before the battle begins. Vital preaching, efficient Sunday school teaching, good music, a beautiful and comfortable church building, and a dignified and attractive church service, are all important factors in the creating and maintaining of interest in the church.

But these things are not all that is necessary. These important things must be supplemented by the equally important personal work of individuals with individuals. We must solicit the interest of the people—even of our own people—as persistently as the travelling salesman solicits his trade. In these distracting times we must keep in constant personal touch with our people or we will lose them. Church work in these days demands that our congregations be organized for constant, systematic, personal work with their men, their women, their young people, and their children.

Imperative as the need is for personal work among the membership of the church, there is still more need of it in the community outside of the church. There are many people in our respective communities who might become interested in the church if the right persons would make it their business to solicit their interest. But we have not been soliciting men on the street and in the shop as Jesus and the Apostles did, and as the foreign missionaries do, and as the modern salesman does. What might we not expect if the good men, the clean and the influential men of our congregations, would make it their business to interest their friends and neighbors in the church! But we have not been doing this. We Christians have not been good salesmen for Christ. We have the goods, but we have not made an adequate effort to get the people interested in it.

Not only should the individual congregations be organized for personal work among the unchurched in their respective parishes, but the congregations of all the denominations of the town or city should be federated for thorough personal work among the unchurched and the indifferent. If the congregations of the community would unite in the plan suggested by the Federal Council's Commission on Evangelism; and if these coöperative efforts would be backed up by the humane ministry of the kingdom, many people would be won for God and the

church whom the Spirit will never move to come of their own accord.

But there are many people in every large community whom no amount of advertising, and no amount of personal solicitation, will induce to come to our churches and Sunday schools. But shall we leave them to their choice, while we continue to conduct services for those who care to come? Can we feel that we are fulfilling our evangelistic obligations in this way? If the church really feels that she has a message for these people she must not hesitate to carry it after them as Jesus and the Apostles did. There are ways of getting our message to these people in the community who will not come to our churches. The public press has come to be the most potent factor in moulding public sentiment on all questions, and the church must not hesitate to use its pages to convey the message which the pulpit can no longer convey. A single issue of the public press reaches more people than all the preachers and Sunday school teachers of the community are able to reach in a week, perhaps in a month. The church must not fail to avail herself of this means to inject the ideals of the kingdom of God into public feeling and opinion. Weekly and monthly magazines have become very potent factors in the moulding of public sentiment. Here is another opportunity that is open to the church to address herself to an element of people who cannot be reached from the pulpit and the Sunday school rostrum. However, to steer clear of the common prejudice against preaching, these newspaper and magazine messages should be as different as possible, both in form and spirit, from the stereotyped sermons that we hear in the church. The essential thing is not that the message contains the conventional text, or that it is an exposition of a portion of Scripture, but that it conveys the spirit and the ideals of the kingdom of God in clear, forceful language. The small pamphlet or tract, which can be published with little expense and placed in every home of a city or town, fur-

nishes another evangelistic opportunity of which the church should avail herself. When Victor Berger, the socialist leader of Milwaukee, was asked why the socialists had made such progress in his city, he gave this pertinent reply: "We put nine-tenth of our income into literature, and every Sunday morning three hundred men are out at five o'clock placing pamphlets into all the homes in the city." The Christian church might well profit by the practical wisdom of the socialists. The people must be enlightened before they will become interested. And since only one out of every ten or fifteen in the average American community comes to church to be enlightened it is clear that we should adopt some new methods of enlightening the people. Many people who are indifferent to the religion of priests and creeds would be interested in the religion of the kingdom of God if they were made familiar with it.

In addition to carrying the Christian message after the people through the public press, magazines, and tracts, the churches of the community should unite at times in holding mass meetings in some public hall or theater to which a certain class of people will come, who cannot be induced to come to our churches. Such services must of necessity be of a quite popular nature or the people whom we desire to reach will not come. They will not come to be preached at. The People's Sunday Evening Meetings which were held in the city of Rochester, New York, for a number of seasons, serve as an example of what should be done in all large communities. These meetings were held in a down-town theater for fifteen or twenty Sunday evenings during the winter. Three Christian ministers, Professor Rauschenbusch, Dr. Strayer, and Dr. Thomas, assisted by a committee of fifteen others made up of prominent Christian business men, professional men, and trades unionists, arranged the meetings. Religious, social, and purely civic and economic questions were discussed. After the question had been presented from the

platform, an opportunity was given for a free discussion from the floor. All the stiffness and the formality, which make the ordinary church service unpopular with a certain class of people, were thus eliminated. The results, as I was informed by one of the participating clergymen, were gratifying. The meetings afforded a splendid opportunity for the application of religious principles to civic and economic affairs. They gave an opportunity to inject the ideals of Jesus into certain aspects of the community's life in a way that is not possible from the pulpit. And the fact that these clergymen and prominent Christian business men met the people of all classes on their own level, discussed their problems, answered their questions, and met their objections in a frank, fair, and courteous way, broke down much of the prejudice against the church which had existed in the minds of these people. Meetings of a similar character have been held in a number of other communities. In each case, so far as I have been able to discover, the results were gratifying.

While such meetings may not—very likely will not—result in the immediate recruiting of many individuals for the church, they nevertheless will help to make the church and a part of her message and program known to a certain class of people whom we cannot reach in any other way. And any method that gets our message to the people is good evangelism. It is not necessary that we should always be thinking of the number of people we may add to the church by our evangelistic efforts. We may perhaps have done that too much in the past. The hedonistic philosophers taught that the best way to make sure of our own happiness is not to keep thinking about it, or directly aiming at it, but rather to work for the happiness of others. And it may be that the surest way of adding people to the church is not to think of making converts, but rather of the good that we may do to the people.

And, finally, our churches should be organized to carry not only the Gospel message down to the last one of the

many unchurched, but also to carry the kingdom-ministry of mercifulness and of helpfulness down to the last helpless man, woman, and child in the community. The churches of the community should be prepared, through social workers, parish nurses, deaconesses, etc., to carry the English language, our American ideals of living, medicine, soap and water, and every form of human helpfulness and encouragement into the many homeless homes from which the sunshine of the kingdom of God has been barred by ignorance, helplessness, and sin. Our personal evangelistic efforts can be powerfully reinforced if, as in the case of the evangelistic labors of Jesus, they will be supplemented by the humane ministry of helpfulness which the kingdom of God implies.

Closing up the Leaks.—No matter how effective our preaching may be, or how thorough our work with individuals may be, much of our labor will go to waste so long as we remain as indifferent as we were in the past, to the environment of the people. A large class of people, as was stated in the preceding section, are not reached by the church because they are born and reared under conditions which make it exceedingly difficult for them to be appealed to by the high ideals of the Christian life. The church today finds herself unable to unbar the doors which her indifference to the social order helped to close many years ago. And if we do reach some of these people for a time it is only to lose them again. The alluring influence of their unregenerated environment is too strong for their stunted wills to master. The only way to evangelize the people of the slums and to keep them evangelized is to abolish the slums. There is no other way. That may mean striking deep into the present social order,—into the matter of housing and renting, and into our whole profit-worshipping system of industry. But it must be done if we are serious in our talk about saving the people. The old type of individualistic evangelism, plucking in-

dividual brands from the fire, without extinguishing the fire, is not a rational treatment of the problem.

Even in our better communities, and among the better class of people, much of our work with individuals goes to waste because of the many evil conditions that still exist. We have been attempting to save individuals by gathering them into the church and the Sunday school, and there insulating them against the evil in the world, only to find, through sad experience, that many of them are very poorly insulated. Not only have we failed to recruit the major portion of our population, but we are constantly losing an alarming number of those whom we had won. The number of names erased from our church records from year to year is amazing. Fully 20% of the catechumens—children from our own church families and who are specially taught in the things of Christ—are lost to the church within ten years after confirmation. About 40% of all the children enrolled in our Sunday Schools are lost to us before they become twenty years of age. In the case of many of these delinquents the fault, so far as it can be determined, is chiefly their own. The finer things of the Christian life have proved no attraction for them. "They prefer the tents of wickedness to the house of the Lord." But in many cases the fault is as much that of the environment as their own. They were encouraged to place their names on the church roll, and then were compelled to live in homes that did not encourage them and help them; and they were obliged to work and seek their recreation in a community that tolerates many evil conditions which have proved their undoing.

The average Christian community is full of moral sinkholes which we have not tried to close up, and in which many of our people are lost. In the average American community, during the last half century, the licensed liquor places have outnumbered the churches and the Sunday schools. Club houses have existed in which intoxicating liquors have been furnished indiscriminately to

men and women, to adults and minors, at all hours of the day and night, and for seven days of the week. In addition to these moral cesspools, the average Christian community has its houses of prostitution, its places of vulgar amusements conducted solely for profit, and many other evils which lure the average man and woman away from the church, and from the things that are clean and holy, with more power than we have at command to draw them. Gathering the children into the Sunday school and into the catechetical class for an hour a week, and then sending them back into a community much of whose life we have complacently left to the devil, will never solve our problems. Hard-worked and poorly nourished as many of them are; compelled by an evil housing system to live in houses that are unfit for human beings to live in; their moral and their æsthetic sense stunted by their birth and their environment,—how can we expect anything but the speedy loss of a great many of them! And I fear that some of our distinguished city officials, some of our profit-fattened landlords who are esteemed members of our churches, and some of us morally short-sighted and socially indifferent Christians, will fare worse before the judgment bar of a just God than these victims of an evil environment.

The great majority of erasures from our list of membership, so far as I have been able to discover, are for non-payment of dues. Here is our greatest leakage. In the majority of these cases there is, no doubt, a moral reason back of the financial delinquency. Most of these people could pay their church dues if they cared to do so. But, on the other hand, there are many good and honest people who will not join the church, and others who have left the church, because they need every cent of their meager income for the daily necessities of life. Reliable investigations of the distribution of income have surprised us with the revelation that fully one-fourth of all the families of the United States, during the decade or two before the

war, were living on less than $600 a year. Every large community in rich America has many families—good, honest families—who cannot afford to pay the dues and the extra benevolence which the church requires of her members without denying themselves some of the vital necessities. And I refuse to cast the first stone at the man who uses the tithe of a $600 or a $700 income to buy an extra bottle of milk for his babies, or a new hat for his wife, rather than give it to the church. The creation of a really Christian public sentiment in favor of steady employment and an efficient-living income for all honest citizens would be a more legitimate and effective piece of evangelism than the calling of a professional evangelist, or the holding of prayer-meetings to pray for the coming of the kingdom. The living wage should at least make it possible for some good people to remain in the church who otherwise are unable to do so; and it would make it possible for many others who remain in the church to do their full share as members.

In a word then: The three essential things which the evangelistic programme of the kingdom implies are a message and a ministry that answer the needs of our modern life; adequate ways and means of getting our message and ministry into vital touch with the people; and the redemption of the community as a means of recruiting individuals and of holding them after we have recruited them.

IV

IS THE PROGRAM OF EVANGELISM IMPLIED IN THE SOCIAL CONCEPTION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD POSSIBLE UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS IN PROTESTANTISM?

The program which the social conception of the kingdom of God implies, and which our age demands, puts a tremendous strain upon the churches of the average Protestant community. There is need, as we have

seen, of a vital message from the pulpit—a message that interprets God to individuals and to the age in clear, forceful language. In no other age was preaching put to so severe a test as in our own day. If preaching is to be saved as a vital factor in the moulding of public sentiment it must be saved from the mediocrity into which it is rapidly being degraded. Only the best preaching will be able to get and to hold the ear of our age. And there is need also of congregational and inter-congregational organization and machinery that will carry our message and our ministry to the last man in the congregation and to the last man in the community. The religion of the kingdom of God implies all of this, and our practical age demands it.

But the average Protestant congregation finds itself unable to carry out this big program. The number of congregations that are prepared to carry out the social service program as suggested by the Federal Council's Commission on Social Service is exceedingly small. The average Protestant congregation, with its shortage of trained leadership, is unable to carry out the program suggested by our denominational commissions on evangelism and social service. It is not possible for the average Reformed congregation to run the machinery recommended in our denominational handbook on: "Local Church Efficiency." Under the divided conditions of our Protestant communities, with our many small and poor congregations where the pastor, the janitor, and the organist are the only paid workers, the vital preaching and the practical ministry which the religion of the kingdom implies are not possible. In the average Protestant community, at the present time, the practical end of the church program cannot be carried out without infringing upon the more fundamental task of teaching and preaching.

We must be on our guard against a very subtle danger at this point. In those congregations where the preacher

is the only specially trained and paid worker, especially where the congregation has a large constituency, so many demands of a practical nature are being made upon the minister's limited time and energy that preaching is fast becoming a neglected art. Too much is demanded of the preacher, who must serve as general manager of every thing that is undertaken by the congregation. He is expected to be an able preacher, an efficient religious educator, an expert financier, a good organizer, and a ready mixer with all classes of people,—a task for which no mere human being can qualify. The pastor may try to divide his time equally between these equally pressing tasks with the result that he will wear himself out while nothing is done well. Or he may divide his time and energy according to the pressure that is put upon him from the outside which, in most cases, will result in his becoming a benevolent tax collector and a man of affairs, while preaching will become a mere side issue.

Vital preaching and practical community service are both necessary. To sacrifice either the one or the other is to surrender a part of the service which the kingdom of God has entrusted to us. One of the specific tasks of the church is to think out ways and means of strengthening both the vital preaching and the practical ministry that is expected of us.

One way out of the present difficulty is through the reorganization of our divided Protestant church. Not only has Protestantism been divided into a multitude of competing denominations and sects, but the denominations themselves have been subdivided into too many small and socially inefficient congregations. We are beginning to recognize the folly of establishing small, competing congregations on every third or fourth street corner of our cities and towns. Whatever there is that we may have gained by encouraging many small congregations rather than fewer and larger ones, it is clear that we have, in this way, sacrificed our social efficiency. The only con-

gregations, according to the Inter-Church Surveys, that have had momentum enough to keep moving forward during the last quarter of a century are the large ones. The small congregations have either stood still or gone back unmercifully; and they have slid back still more so far as their influence on the community is concerned. The small congregation cannot carry out the big program which the social conception of the kingdom implies, and which the community of which the church is a part demands. There is urgent need in almost every Protestant community for the consolidation of many of our small and socially inefficient congregations. One large congregation, with a judiciously planned division of labor, and with expert departmental superintendents, can render a much more efficient service to its own constituency and to its community, than a number of small and inadequately equipped congregations can render.

In the section of the city in which I am serving there are three congregations of the Reformed church within a radius of four squares of each other. These congregations are far above the average Protestant congregation in numerical strength. One of them has a membership of 1500, and the other two of about 1000 each. Two of these congregations have paid secretaries who give all of their time to the work of the congregation. But these two secretaries, who are nothing more than ordinary stenographers, are the only paid workers in addition to the pastor, the organist, and the janitor. The result is three socially inefficient congregations. There is no division of labor, because there is no specially trained and paid leadership. In each case the pastor must be preacher, religious educator, financier, organizer and director of men's work, of women's work, and of young people's work,—a task too great for any man. In addition to these outstanding congregational tasks, there are other duties which no man can number, and which the pastor dare not neglect. There is no one man who can do all

these things, and do them well. All things must be poorly done, or else some things must be left undone. And too frequently it is the preparation for effective preaching that is left undone. No man can attend to the multitudinous affairs that demand attention under conditions like these and preach two sermons each Sunday that are worth coming to hear.

If these three inadequately equipped and poorly organized congregations were united in one big congregation, with a carefully planned division of labor under trained leadership, a much more efficient service could be rendered to its own constituency and to the community at large than is now being rendered by the three institutions. And it could be done for less money than is now spent in running the three competitive institutions.

The big congregation could, first of all, afford a church plant designed and equipped to render real service. In addition to the church auditorium, there could be a Sunday school building in which it would be possible to conduct a school of religious education, something that very few congregations have at the present time. And it would be possible to have a real community house with a real library, a gymnasium, a banquet hall, social rooms, etc., such as the full religious culture of our people demands. Through the division of labor one man could be left as free as possible to preach. Not only could the preacher be as free as possible from mentally distracting detail work, which the constant preparation for effective preaching demands, but he would be inspired to do his best by the assurance of a worth-while audience to whom to preach. The small congregation not only makes constructive community work impossible, but it also discourages preaching. The best preacher in the country would deteriorate into mediocrity within ten years if he were obliged to preach to twenty-five or fifty people from Sunday to Sunday and with no hope of a better audience. In addition to the preacher, there could be a specially

trained and paid religious educator, who would give all his time to this important department of the work. Such a congregation could also afford the services of an expert financier, who would be made responsible for this ever-increasingly burdensome department of church work. And, on what is now wasted in running the three competitive churches, the service of an expert in young people's work, and of some one who is qualified to bring the church into vital touch with the aliens in the community, could be secured. One such big and efficient congregation could impress itself upon the community in a way that is not possible for a number of small and weak congregations to do.[1]

In many of our smaller communities there are two or three small, half-starved, poorly equipped congregations of the same denomination, and only a fifteen or twenty minute's walk apart. Not only the need of social efficiency, but plain business sense demands their consoli dation into one congregation which could then prepare itself to render some real service. In the majority of towns and boroughs, especially here in the East, there are half a dozen or more small, pitifully poor and hopelessly incompetent congregations of different denominations whose energy is all spent in just keeping alive. The big service which the kingdom of God implies cannot be rendered by the churches of such a community. I spent a brief vacation, some time ago, in a delightful town of about 3500 inhabitants in which there are ten Protestant churches. The average size of these congregations is about 150, and the average attendance about 65. The combined salaries of the ten clergymen amount to about

[1] In Allentown, a city of 80,000 people, there are ten congregations of the Reformed Church in the United States, with a combined membership of about 7,000. Three congregations, conveniently located, more especially since our city is very compactly built, could serve our own people and the city better than the ten congregations can.

$15,000, and the total running expenses of the ten congregations to about $25,000. It would be amusing to think of the efficiency of these ten congregations if the thing were not so tragic. It is a crime to continue wasting our energy in this way. The churches of such a community cannot render the service which the kingdom of God entrusts to them. One religious organization, with the kind of plant and the judiciously planned division of labor indicated above, could render a much more acceptable service to its own members and to the town than is possible for the ten independent congregations to render. And it could be done with less money than is now spent in running the ten competitive institutions. Some such reconstruction must take place in our divided Protestant communities if the vital preaching and the practical ministry which the kingdom of God implies shall be made possible.

It is clear, furthermore, that the carrying out of the big program of the kingdom of God requires the training of a new type of church worker. The full kingdom program cannot be carried out by the preacher and a corps of willing workers. In the average congregation, no matter how strong it may be numerically, the people cannot be found who have the necessary qualifications of ability, consecration, willingness, and leisure to do the work that must be done. It can be done only through the leadership of specially trained men and women, who are paid for their services. The need is growing daily for specially trained religious educators, who will be able to introduce into our Bible schools the scientific methods of instruction that are employed in our public schools. There is also a growing demand for specially trained church financiers, for specialists in young people's work, and for men and women who are qualified to work with the aliens in our cosmopolitan communities. These specialists are just as essential to the success of the enlarged church program as are the preachers themselves. In

some communities their work may count for more than the work of the old-line preacher.

The training of this new type of church worker imposes a new task upon the educational institutions of the church. Special schools should be established, or special departments should be added to our denominational colleges or our theological seminaries, in which this new type of church worker can receive the necessary training. Our theological seminaries should do in their particular field what our great universities have done in the larger field of education. The special merit of our universities is their persistent effort to meet the needs which our growing, changing age has been placing before them. They have been adding special courses and new departments as the need for special kinds of training became imperative. We shall expect from our church institutions at least the same willingness, if not the same ability, to serve.

To meet the need which the training for the modern ministry implies, may necessitate a radical readjustment in the educational department of our denominational life. It may require the closing-up of a number of small and inadequately equipped schools, which are incompetent to prepare workers of the quality and of the variety that are demanded. There is no legitimate reason why a small denomination which is scarcely able to equip and maintain one college and one theological seminary, should waste money and energy in maintaining half a dozen or more such institutions, all of which will, of dire necessity, be so poorly equipped in men and in material resources as to render them wholly incompetent to meet the demands which our exacting age is making upon us. One large, well equipped educational institution can render a more acceptable service to two or three thousand students than half a dozen small, inadequately equipped institutions can render to the same number of students. The new age will be an age of big, cooperating institutions in the

interest of service and efficiency; and this spirit must invade our church life or we will fail in the big things that are expected of us.

We hope that some day our zeal for the kingdom of God will overcome our sectarian prejudice and our religious narrowness. In that day there will be fewer congregations, but larger and better ones; and there will be fewer denominational institutions of learning, but larger and more efficient ones. Until that time comes much of what is implied in the program of the kingdom must be left undone.

THE CHURCH AND THE INTENSIVE GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM OR THE PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIANIZATION

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CHURCH AND THE INTENSIVE GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM, OR THE PROBLEMS OF CHRISTIANIZATION

THE kingdom of God is rooted in evangelization and comes to fruitage in christianization. The purpose of evangelization is to win formal acceptance of the principles of the kingdom, while the purpose of christianization is to make these principles function in our individual and our social life. In this chapter I shall speak of the christianizing of the individual, the community, the nation, and that basic department of our life, industry.

I

CHRISTIANIZING THE INDIVIDUAL

Our first task is with the individual; but that task is not finished when we have made him a member of the church. Our work with the individual is not finished until we have inspired him to govern his life in all its relationships in conformity with the ideals and the motives of the kingdom of God. Our work with the individual is not finished until we have made him both willing and able to participate in such a society as the kingdom of God implies.

And what, so far as we can determine it, has the church accomplished in the way of giving men capacity to live the kingdom-life? What has she made of the men and the women whom she has recruited? In what vital respects are the people in the church different from the

people outside of the church? How much better are they, and how much better is the community in which they live, because of their membership in the church? Can the church view the results of her efforts at christianization with a fair degree of satisfaction? Can she, with a fair degree of truth, say with her Lord: "Father, the work Thou gavest me to do have I done?"

The Church's work not to be despised.—The church's work has by no means been fruitless. Her membership compares very favorably with any other group of people to be found anywhere. One need not hesitate to say that the 42,000,000 Christians in the United States are, on the whole, the best people in the United States; and that the several hundred million Christians throughout the world are, on the whole, the best people in the world. If we could compare the best people in the church with the best outside, and the worst people in the church with the worst outside, the balance would unquestionably be in favor of the church people. The influence of Jesus Christ has been the greatest moral force in the world for two thousand years; and his influence has been able to exert itself more effectively in the church than outside of it. There is no question that it is better to be a member of the church than not to be one. No one who has a fair knowledge of men and of history would care to deny that the church has developed a type of individual character that compares very favorably with the best that is to be found anywhere.

The Church's work not above criticism.—While it cannot be disputed that the members of the Christian church compare very favorably, man for man, with any non-church group, nevertheless our efforts at christianization have not been above criticism. There are certain critics whose judgment may not be disregarded as incompetent or stigmatized as blasphemous, who contend that there is

something associated with our methods of church work that has a tendency to produce a double standard of morality in our members. That means that there is something connected with our methods of making Christians that tends to develop a Pharasaic piety that makes a good showing when on parade, but not necessarily so when off parade. This is the criticism of Henrik Ibsen, the great Norwegian dramatist, and of Blasco Ibanez, the popular Spanish novelist, both of whom have wielded great influence in certain circles in Europe and America. Ibsen especially has been severe on the church on this point. He charges her with having produced a type of men who are better on Sundays than they are the rest of the week; men who are good in the light, but not necessarily so in the dark; men who are good at home where the people know them, but not necessarily so away from home where they are not known.[1]

Of a more serious nature is the charge that we are producing good church people, who are not good Christians, i. e., people who are devoted to the church, but who do not live the life of the kingdom of God. Mr. Winston Churchill, in "The Inside of the Cup," gives a graphic portrait of Eldon Parr and his associates, who are zealously devoted to the church, but who are callously indifferent to the needs of their neighbors. Mr. Parr is the champion of orthodoxy. He comes to church regularly in his elegant motor car, and occupies a front pew. He contributes liberally to missions and to every other benevolent cause of the church. But he has made his wealth by violating the principles of the kingdom of God. He is directly responsible for bad housing conditions which have helped to breed tuberculosis among the poor of the city. He is responsible for living conditions that have driven young girls into prostitution, one of whom was formerly the sweetheart of his own son. The hardness of his unregenerated heart ruined his own family. Never-

[1] See, Pillars of Society.

theless he is a most devoted church man, the arch-champion of orthodoxy, and one of a clique of wealthy reactionaries who tie the hands of their progressive pastor and domineer the whole congregation. The undisguised insinuation of Mr. Churchill is (and his feeling is shared by many others) that it is no uncommon thing to find men of the Eldon Parr type in our churches,—men who are devoted to the church, but not to the cause of righteousness.

Others charge the church with developing a type of men who are good in their private life, but bad in their public life,—men who are true to their wives, kind to their children, and good to their neighbors,—men who would do no wrong as individuals, but whose stock companies and trusts which represent their interests are guilty of great wrong. This is the criticism of staunch friends of the church and men of eminent authority like Rauschenbusch, Vedder, Mathews, and many others. The best thing that I have ever read from the pen of "Billy" Sunday is the following criticism of this type of church people. "We have produced here in America a type of men who are religious in the best sense of the term in their private lives, but who in their professional, commercial, and industrial relations, where other people are concerned, do not seem to think that their religion need necessarily enter. In other words, this idea of religion has produced men whose private lives are good, but whose public lives are rotten, vile, bad. While they are true to their marriage vows and virtuous, they are rotten in politics. We have produced men, who, while they would not shoot a man with a pistol, will sit in New York or in Philadelphia and by a vote in the Board of Directors' meeting set in motion forces that will take lives out on the Pacific coast months afterward. While they would not hand you a dose of poison, they will sell adulterated goods that will kill people a thousand miles away. If your religion will not make you sell straight

goods, then it does not amount to ! ! ! in the pews either. Men who would not pick the pockets of one man with the fingers of their hands will, without hesitation, pick the pockets of 100,000,000 people with the fingers of their monopoly or commercial advantage. Men who will gladly draw their check for $10,000 and give it to a children's hospital, see nothing inconsistent in the fact that the $10,000 for the children's hospital came out of $200,000 made from a system of child labor that maims and crushes and kills more children in one year that the hospital can heal in twenty years." [1]

Still others charge us with turning out many individuals against whom no positive evil can be charged either in their private life or their public life, but who take no interest in establishing the kingdom of God on earth. Their goodness is of the pale, negative type; and they are, for this reason, mere ciphers in the stern battle for a better world. They would form no monopoly to enrich themselves at the expense of their fellow men. They will sell you no adulterated goods. Neither will they put forth any constructive efforts to build a social order that will prevent others from doing these evil things. They are good people, but they do not represent the rugged type of goodness that is required in an age of social rebuilding. They are Christians, but they lack an essential element of the full-fledged kingdom-Christian.

And, finally, and most damaging of all, is the charge that the church, as an institution, has either been a cipher or an obstacle in social progress. This charge is brought not only by social radicals, but also by friends of the church. Here is the opinion which an influential Christian magistrate in one of the largest cities of Great Britain gave when questioned recently on a certain matter by a delegation of British church men. "The church," he

[1] From a sermon preached in Philadelphia and reported by the *North American*.

said. "has opposed every movement toward freedom that has been initiated, whether it be the freedom of the person—for example the abolition of slavery, restriction of punishment, cancellation of employer's power; or of the mind—for example education; or of the spirit—for example science, self-government. To this day we who serve in public authorities, know that the church must be accounted hostile, or of doubtful neutrality, in any movement that we start. Generations have seen the church antagonistic or indifferent, and now they say, 'never heed the church; it is of no importance.' In this great city, in all its important movements, the opinion of organized churches, ministers, sessions, and all the rest of it, count for absolutely nothing. The Town Council has—members; yet, when a church deputation comes, there is not one man who cares the snap of the fingers for its opinion. It is all a great pity and a great mistake, but it is true. And it is the church's own fault. It won't take a risk for a principle." [1]

We are well aware that some of this criticism is colored by the ignorance or the prejudice of the critic. There is a tendency on the part of many of the church's critics to draw general conclusions from a limited experience and observation. Because the man of the gutter has found a few church people who are as vile as he is, he is not thereby warranted to conclude that nobody in the church is better than he is. Or because Mr. Isben found a few prominent church people, in his rather limited acquaintance, whose piety was divorced from their morality, he is not justified in holding up all church people before the world as being guilty of living double lives. Or because a good Christian and a man of sound judgment has found the established church of England to be an obstruction in the way of social progress and a nonenity in

[1] See: "Can the Church and Industry Unite," by David Carnagie, M. P., p. 78.

British public opinion, he must not infer that the same is true of the church in all other countries.

Nevertheless there is something about this criticism that sounds so much like that which the prophets and Jesus pronounced upon the church and its membership in their day that it will be well for us to take it seriously. If there is any tendency in our methods of church work to turn out people upon whose life we have made no impression at all; and men who are devoted to the church, but not to the cause of humanity; and men who are good in their private life, but bad in their public life; and great numbers of individuals who are not guilty of any positive wrong doing, but who are not interested in winning the present social order for God, it is well that we should subject our whole religious system to an honest and thoroughgoing criticism. It is not impossible that there may be something wrong with our formal system of religion—with our method of making Christians. In the interest of truth and righteousness we must not hesitate to enter even the Holy of Holies, and to analyze and to expose the shortcomings of things that we have long held to be too sacred to criticise.

The Shortcomings of Priestly Religion.—It is a matter that challenges serious reflection that both the prophets and Jesus blamed the system of the priests more than they blamed the individuals under the system for the general lack of robust character in the church of their day. The root of the trouble was that ritualism and ceremonialism had usurped the function of true religion. The model religious man was the one who scrupulously observed all the ceremonial and ritualistic requirements of the church. He burned up, as a sacrifice to his God, the animals which he had laboriously raised, and felt that this was all that God required of him. There was no vital relation between a man's religion and his dealings with his neighbors.

Against this perversion of the true religion the prophets spoke with great fervor and frankness. Hosea, in his efforts to interpret the will of Jehovah, said; "I desire mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings." [1] Isaiah said: "Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; new moon and Sabbath, the calling of Assemblies,—I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting. Your new moons and appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me: I am weary to bear them. And when you will spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers I will not hear: Your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean: put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment, release the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." [2] Micah, a country preacher, who preached to a generation that was studiously exact in the performance of the religious ceremonies, but painfully deficient in its sense of justice and mercy, contrasted the priestly with the prophetic conception in the following magnificent paragraph: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself down before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or tens of thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first born for my transgression; the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? The Lord hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before thy God.[3]

The church in those days did not produce the type of character that the prophets felt they had a right to expect, and they blamed the system of the priests, which di-

[1] 6: 6.
[2] 1: 13-17.
[3] 6: 6-8

verted the religious instincts of the people from conduct to ceremonies. The practice of the church was a hindrance rather than a help to the cause of righteousness. We must not be surprised therefore that some of the more radical social prophets tried to destroy the very foundation upon which the sacrificial system rested. Both Amos and Jeremiah denied that God had ever commanded sacrifices and ceremonies at all. "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies.* * *Did you bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" [1] Jeremiah says: "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." [2]

George Adam Smith, in his commentary on Amos, says: "The cult of the national God, at the national sanctuaries, in the national interest, and by the whole body of people, who practiced it with a zeal unparalleled by their forefathers,—this is what Amos condemns. And he does so absolutely. He has nothing but scorn for the temples and the feasts. The assiduity of attendance, the liberality of gifts, the employment of wealth and art and patriotism in worship—he tells his generation that God hates it all. Like Jeremiah he even seems to imply that God never instituted in Israel any sacrifices or offerings." [3]

The prophets conceived of religion in terms of character, not in terms of ritualism or ceremonialism. What God had commanded was obedience to his righteous will which, according to the prophets, implied justice and mercy to one's fellow men, and humble mindedness be-

[1] Amos, 5: 21-25.
[2] 7: 22-24.
[3] Amos, "The Expositors Bible," p. 156.

fore one's God. These ends were defeated rather than fostered by the priestly system. And the social-minded prophets showed no respect for a system of religion that was not securing the ends and purposes of Jehovah. They showed no mercy for the church of their day, which was developing a type of individual piety that was divorced from social morality.

But the mechanical system of the priests outlived the ethical passion of the prophets. After the exile there was a reaction in favor of the priest and his mechanical system. The national calamity was traced to the people's irreligion. But irreligion was interpreted as a lack of loyalty to the priestly laws and regulations rather than deficiency in the practice of justice and mercy. More than ever before were the people's religious instincts diverted from life to ceremony. This de-ethicizing process in Israel' religion had come to its zenith some time before Jesus was born. The truly religious man, or the man who was in special favor with God, was the one who obeyed the letter of the law, and was true to all the traditions of the elders. He fasted twice in the week, and gave the church a tenth of all his possessions down to the worthless mints that grew of themselves in his back yard. And the unfortunate part of it was that this mechanical performance exhausted the requirements of religion. When this lip and hand service was faithfully performed nothing further was required. Religion was completely divorced from life.

The post-Exilic priestly system developed some very pious souls, and some really virile characters; but on the whole it failed just as it did in the days of the prophets. Jesus condemned the religious system of his day as vehemently as the prophets did in their day. He pronounced judgment upon the system of the priests and the Pharisees because it had developed more hypocrites than men of substantial character. They cleansed the outside of the platter, but within, where the seat of character is,

they were full of extortion and excess. They whitewashed the outside of the sepulchre, but within they were full of dead men's bones—the bones of men they had devoured in their public life. On the Sabbath and in public places they offered long prayers, and on week days and in secret they devoured the widow's house and robbed the orphan. A tenth of what they had thus taken from their defenceless brethern they pretended to give to God by sanctifying it on the altar. They compassed sea and land in their zeal to make proselytes, and then made them worse than they were while they were Gentiles.

No more merciless criticism of priestly religion was ever uttered than this. But Jesus knew what he was doing. The religion of the priests and the Phariesees failed to produce the type of character that Jesus was looking for. It failed to develop men who dealt justly with their fellow men, and who were merciful to the weak and the helpless, and who walked humbly before their God. It developed a type of men who were faithful to the church, but not to the cause of righteousness. In the interest of the kingdom of God Jesus denounced the system of the priests because it was largely to blame for the perversion of religion from which the age was suffering. The priests taught that the man who gave his money to the Temple, which supported their system, was exempt from the most sacred social duty,—that of caring for his indigent parents. The money that was placed upon the altar was declared to have the blood of the widow and the orphan, from whom it was taken, washed off. Under the theology of the priests and the Pharisees the church had degenerated into a social parasite which drained the life of the community without giving back an equivalent in service. Jesus pronounced judgment upon the church of his day because it had become a hindrance rather than a help to the cause of the kingdom of God.

But once more, in the long course of history, the program of the priest gained the victory over the passion

of the prophet. During the Middle Ages the ethical religion of Jesus went to seed in the priestly system of the Catholic church. Religion was interpreted in terms of churchliness rather than in terms of life. The saint was the man who obeyed all the external regulations of the church, rather than the man who loved his neighbor as himself. Men were made saintly by a magical rather than by a vital process. Through baptism, through confirmation by the laying on of hands by a priest who stood in the unbroken line of the Apostolic succession, and by means of the holy wafer and the consecrated wine which were reputed to have become miraculously changed into the very flesh and blood of the crucified Savior, the individual was declared to become transformed from a sinner, totally corrupt, into a saint fit for the New Jerusalem. Through the magic of the sacraments divine grace was declared to become miraculously operative in the individual church member's soul. The religious life thus generated expressed itself in the performance of the religious ceremonies of the church, rather than in constructive efforts at building the kingdom of God. Not only was the righteousness of Jesus declared to become imputed to the members of the church, but even the extra merits of good men could be bought in the ecclesiastical market and placed to the credit of morally deficient church members. It is difficult to conceive of a more thoroughly nauseating thing than such deceitful playing with the credulity of ignorant and superstitious people in the name of Jesus Christ.

It would be ungrateful of us not to recognize the religious service of the Catholic church during this dark period. The monks and the priests preserved the seed-corn of the Christian religion from destruction in a wicked world. And it would be wrong to infer that the Catholic church of this period did not produce some splendid characters. Some of the most pious souls of all history were developed in the monasteries of the Mediæval

Church. Nor should we overlook the charitable service rendered by some of the organizations of the church of that day. The monasteries were communistic associations from whose doors no needy persons were ever turned away. But the fact remains that the morality of the clergy, and of the rank and file of the laity, was at very low ebb. The Catholic church of this period failed to inspire her members to take their place in the kind of society that the kingdom of God implies. On the contrary, Mediæval religion unfitted men for that world-redeeming social life which is the very soul of the religion of the prophets and Jesus. On the whole the results of the Mediæval churchly religion were as unsatisfactory, from the ethical or social point of view, as were those of the Jewish church of fifteen centuries before. It can be said with truth that for two thousand years, from the days of Amos and Micah to the time of Luther and Zwingle, the church hindered the cause of the kingdom of God, or the righteous social order, about as much as it helped it.

The Protestant Reformation was an honest attempt to save the Christian religion from the errors and abuses of Catholicism. But Protestantism has not saved religion altogether from the unethical tendencies of the priestly system. Many of the Mediæval doctrines, which are a hindrance rather than a help in the stimulation of ethical or social endeavor, are still clinging to our theology. Many Protestant Christians, perhaps the majority of them, still view the church as a Noah's Ark that shall conduct them safely out of this world, rather than as an organization for the establishing of a righteous social order. I fear that the majority of people still join the church that they may be sure of going to heaven when they die, rather than that they may be equipped for service in the interest of the kingdom of God on earth. So long as this is the case membership in the Christian church will fail to have the ethically and socially stimulating effect that it should have. In many quarters of the

church the unethical theories of the atonement are still vigorously defended and eloquently preached. The people are made to believe that the sacrifice of Jesus on the Cross has been accepted by God as payment for their own personal guilt; or that his righteousness is magically imputed to them because they have joined the church, subscribed to her creeds, and partake of her sacraments. Many Protestant Christians still believe in the regenerative magic of baptism and the Lord's Supper. They believe that baptism innoculates the child against sin somewhat as the typhus anti-toxin makes one immune from typhoid fever. They believe that the sinner and the half-sinner are magically transformed into saints by means of the consecrated bread and wine in the Holy Communion. We still overemphasize divine grace as operating magically through the sacraments, while we slight the idea of the divine will as coöperating with the human will for ethical and social ends. There are still many of us who feel that when we have worshipped God in the church on Sunday by repeating creeds and prayers, by singing hymns, and by giving an offering for benevolence, we have exhausted the requirements of religion. But this is precisely the thing that the prophets and Jesus censured so severely in their day. This type of religion has failed to develop the kind of Christian individual who is a vital factor in the establishing of the kingdom of God on earth.

Let no one mistake this as speaking lightly of sacred things, or of religious practices that have become hallowed by centuries of usage. I speak of these things as I do only because of the overmastering conviction that the emphasis we are placing on these external matters is still defeating the ends of the religion of the kingdom of God. We are still doing what they did in the days of Jesus and the prophets. We are still making ends of things which, at best, can serve only as means to a higher end. As the law was only a school-master to the Gospel, as

Saint Paul expressed it, so the ceremonial and individualistic religion of the past should be considered only as a school-master to the higher ethical and social type of religion that is implied in the doctrine of the kingdom of God. I am convinced that the priestly methods which were largely responsible, in the days of the prophets and Jesus, for the presence in the church of many men who were faithful to the religious system, but unjust and unmerciful in their dealings with their neighbors, are also, in large measure, responsible for whatever there is of this same evil in the church today. As a result of the theology and the religious customs which we have inherited from the past, and which we have not had the wisdom and the courage to change, we still have a class of people in our churches who are good church people but poor Christians. There is still too much in our theology and in our church life that fails to stimulate the moral will of the individual member, and that fails to inspire constructive efforts for social regeneration in the group of Christians.

But what else can we do to make people Christian? How can we prepare our people to take their place in the righteous social order which the kingdom of God bids us establish?

Making Christians a Vital Rather than a Magical Process.—Perhaps the first surprise that one trained in the ways of the church gets when he makes a critical study of the Gospels is the discovery that the ceremonial and the sacramental elements which the church has placed so conspicuously in the foreground, are there kept in the dim background. It is clear, even to the casual reader, that Jesus paid but slight attention to the ritualistic and ceremonial practices of the church of his day. It is beyond dispute that he did not consider the ceremonial requirements of the church as essential to the living of the kingdom-life. It is a debatable question whether

he considered even baptism and the Lord's Supper as special means of grace.

It is true, according to the Gospel records, that Jesus submitted to the baptism of John the Baptist, and that his own disciples practiced the rite, at least during the earlier part of his ministry. But the Synoptic narratives do not warrant the conclusion that Jesus thought of water baptism as a means of grace. There is no evidence that the rite was assigned a place in the religious program of the kingdom. It was not a part of the vital process by which Jesus tried to make men fit subjects of the kingdom of God.[1]

It seems probable also, we may say quite certain, that Jesus would have had something more to say about the Lord's Supper if it had held the important place in his mind that it has always held in the mind of the church. It is inconceivable that Jesus should never even have alluded to this important rite until the very last evening of his life, if he felt that man's salvation was in any way dependent upon its proper observance. It is clear from the Gospel records that the Lord's Supper had its origin in connection with Jesus' last observance of the Jewish Feast of the Passover without the slightest previous allusion to it. If Jesus meant it to become a permanent

[1] The only Scriptural evidence that Jesus assigned water baptism a place in his program is Matt. 28: 19. But it is a debatable question whether this verse as it stands may be attributed to Jesus. The prominence which it gives to an outward form is out of harmony with the spirit of all the previous teachings of Jesus. And, furthermore, there is no trace of the Trinitarian formula of baptism throughout the Apostolic Age. Every one of the Apostles, so far as the New Testament records inform us, baptized in the name of Jesus only, which would be inconceivable if there had been any knowledge of a specific command of the Master to baptize in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. On this subject see: Wendt, "Die Lehre Jesu," II, 610; also Gilbert, "The Revelation of Jesus," pp. 127-129; and Allen, "The International Critical Commentary on Matthew, pp. 305–308.

rite, its origin would indicate that it was to do for his followers what the Passover Feast had done for the Jews. It was to be a memorial of the deliverance from the bondage of the old religious order as the Passover was a memorial of the deliverance from the bondage of Egypt. As such the Lord's Supper, like the Jewish Passover, has both historical and ethical value. As a memorial of the one who gave his life in an effort to lead mankind on to a higher and nobler life, it is a most sacred ordinance. But its value is inspirational and ethical, not magical. There is no virtue in its observance if it fails to inspire in us the same sacrificial spirit that was in Jesus. The direction to eat his flesh and drink his blood in the Capernaum speech the day after the feeding of the 5000, and which has no reference at all to the memorial feast which was instituted a full year later, means the same that the Fourth Gospel means elsewhere by believing on Jesus. It indicates an act of the will whereby we make Jesus' ideals and motives our own.

Neither does the simple ethical Gospel of Jesus, when viewed as a whole, warrant the doctrine, so commonly taught by the church, that he saves us by his atoning death, the super-merits of which are, in some magical way, imputed to us. If it had not been for the prominence of the vicarious idea in Jewish theology, and in certain other religious cults, no Christian theologian would have construed the few isolated and purely random sayings of Jesus in reference to his death in such a way as to make them the basis for the substitutionary theory of the atonement. Jesus himself does not create the impression that he saves us by the merits of his death rather than by the inspiration of his life. The sacrificial element, in the substitutionary sense, has been read into the saving work of Jesus, not out of it. His death was only the logical result of his devotion to a great ideal and to an overmastering sense of duty. Instead of its super-meritoriousness being mechanically put down to

our credit, it must inspire in us the same heroic devotion to the same ideals. If it fails to do this, it fails in its saving influence upon us. There is nothing in the teaching of Jesus, much less in his spirit, that warrants us to believe that his death on the cross will do anything for us if it fails to inspire in us the same majestic devotion to right and duty that characterized Jesus himself.

If then it was not by the super-meritoriousness of his atoning death, nor by the magic of the sacraments, that Jesus sought to make his followers fit subjects of the kingdom of God, how did he do it?

Nothing really can be simpler than Jesus' efforts to convert men from their selfish ways to the unselfish life of the kingdom of God. There is nothing unnatural or unpsychological about the methods of Jesus. His first appeal was to *the understanding of his hearers.* His first effort was to give men light. He began by showing men the truth. He revealed God as the Father of the whole human race and of each individual of the race. He revealed man as a child of God and, therefore, a brother—*a real brother*—to all of whom God is the Father. He made it clear that citizenship in the kingdom of God does not depend upon being born of father Abraham, or upon faithfulness to the priestly system, but upon living as a child of God and as a brother—*a real brother*—to all men. He showed men the nature of righteousness and its blessedness; and he showed them the folly of sin and its curse. And all his teachings, no matter how profound the subject, were presented in the simple language of the common people. All his discourses were profusely illustrated with objects from nature, and with incidents from the everyday life of the people. In his clear, forceful appeals to the understanding of his audience Jesus discloses one of the essentials in the work of christianizing individuals. Men must be made to see and understand the truth before they can

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

be expected to live it. *Jesus was a teacher, not a priest.*

The second noteworthy thing that Jesus did was to appeal to the *moral sense,* or *the will,* of those whom he instructed in the truth. To know the truth is very important, but it is not sufficient of itself. It is very important that men should know the will of the Father, but it is more important that they should will to do His will. Jesus understood life. He knew that all our efforts to make men good are wasted until we have succeeded in quickening the will-to-be-good. Therefore Jesus first gave men light, and then appealed to them to live up to the light which they had. Although Jesus studiously avoided emotional excitement, he did not slight the emotions in his efforts to reach the will. He revealed the Father's tender love; and then appealed to the people to be the kind of children with whom such a loving Father could be pleased. He revealed to sinners the folly of their way, and the sure destruction that awaits them if they persist in their sins; and then plead with them to repent and return to their heavenly Father who is as ready to forgive His penitent children as an earthly parent is. In his clear appeals to the understanding of his audience, and in his fervent appeals to their moral sense, Jesus, like the prophets before him, stands in strong contrast to the mechanical religious teachers of his day, and to many since his day.

Jesus appealed not only to the understanding and the will of his followers, but also to *their love* and *their loyalty.* One of his supreme efforts was to draw to himself a circle of followers who would be loyal to him and to the kingdom of God to which he had dedicated all his powers. The very last test that he made of his disciples was the loyalty test. Three times he put the question to Simon Peter: Simon, do you love me? . . . Simon, are you sure that you love me? . . . Simon, are you sure that you love me more than you love this beautiful lake and fishing on this lake? And when Simon said: Lord,

Thou knowest that I love Thee, Jesus said: Then you are my disciple. A loving and intelligent loyalty to Jesus and to the cause of the kingdom of God is one of the supreme requisites of Christian discipleship. Nothing else can take the place of it. Baptisms, fastings, and communions are as nothing compared with it. Not only did this spirit of loyalty make devoted missionaries of the disciples, but it also had a transforming effect on their life and conduct as nothing else could have. Loving loyalty to a person like Jesus Christ, and intelligent loyalty to such ethical and social ideals as those which are represented in the doctrine of the kingdom of God, will have a regenerating effect upon the individual's character as no amount of religious rites and ceremonies can ever have.

The final redemptive purpose of Jesus was the creation of *a regenerated environment*—the kingdom of God—in which individual growth in righteousness would be as free and as spontaneous as possible. Out in the unregenerated Gentile world, Jesus said Christian discipleship would be difficult, and in many cases quite impossible. But in the kingdom of God, or in the regenerated social order, individual growth in righteousness would be as natural as the growth of a healthy tree in a well-kept garden. It is in and through the kingdom of God that Jesus will ever be present with his disciples. It is in and through the kingdom of God that the Holy Spirit will work with us and for us. Participation in the kingdom of God will have a transforming effect on the character of the individual as life outside of the kingdom cannot furnish.

Jesus then tried to make men fit subjects of his kingdom here and hereafter by a calm, clear appeal to the understanding, the will, and the loyalty of the individual disciples, plus the ethically transforming effect which life in a regenerated society will have upon individual character.

It is a mistake for the church to attempt to make Christians by any less vital methods than Jesus himself used. It is a mistake for the church to slight the ethical methods of her Master, and to continue magnifying the mechanical methods of the priests.

The first duty of the church is to teach, in simple language, the fundamental principles of the kingdom as they are revealed in the life and teachings of Jesus. Men must be made to understand what citizenship in the kingdom requires of them, before they can become real citizens. The church must make clear what the vital, human religion of the kingdom implies for all the people under all the human and divine relationships which bind individuals to each other and to their God. Jesus did not blame the masses of his day for not seeing more in religion than the keeping of the traditions of the elders and the perfunctory performance of the priestly requirements. They did not know better because the church had not taught them better. It is the duty of the church to furnish the light in which men shall walk. The priest must yield his time-honored place to the teacher. A teaching church must take the place of the ritualistic church.

In addition to generating light the church must also generate moral *motive power*. Until we have stimulated a man's will-to-be-good everything else that we may do will, from a pure moral point of view, go to waste. So long as a man does not will to be good there is nothing either on earth or in heaven that can make him good. If a man does not want to be good all the water in the holy Jordan, and all the consecrated wine and wafers in Christendom, will avail nothing at all. The moral life has its tap-root in the will-to-be-moral. Regeneration from creature selfishness to unselfish Christian love cannot be accomplished by holy magic. It can never be accomplished apart from the individual's own will-to-be-regenerated. Eugenics, environment, and the various

forms of social service, are of great importance, as I shall endeavor to show in the next section. But all of these disciplines, important as they are, can, from a pure moral point of view, do no more than make it as natural and as easy as possible for the will to be good. The enlightening and the stimulating of the moral will is, therefore, the paramount thing that we must aim at in our efforts to make men citizens of the kingdom of God. In this most essential thing in Christian culture the church has been seriously at fault. She has disregarded the fundamental laws of psychology and of pedagogy. All through history she has appealed to the superstitions and the credulity of the people, rather than to their enlightened wills. We are still magnifying the magical efficacy of the sacraments, of creedal faith, and of mere church membership, rather than the need of a good will—a will that is intelligently devoted to such holy and rational ends as those implied in the doctrine of the kingdom of God. Our church mechanics have been detrimental to that vital type of religion which the social prophets and Jesus representaed, and which our age needs.

In addition to generating light and motive power the church must create and maintain a moral and spiritual *environment* in which the enlightened and well-intentioned individual can be what he could not be outside of this environment. The individual must not only know what is required of him, and be willing to be and to do what he knows he ought to be and do, but he must also have *help*,—the help that can come only through life in a community that is dedicated to the cause to which he wishes to dedicate himself. No individual, no matter how strong and determined his good will may be, can be by himself alone what he could be through association and communion with other wills like his own. This law of the social and the spiritual world has its analogy in the physical world. For example: an ordinary steel magnet has a certain lifting or drawing power of its own.

It may have the power to lift a grain or two of iron filings by virtue of its own inherent strength. But place a number of such magnets together so as to form a community of magnets, and the lifting or drawing power of each individual magnet will become considerably increased. The magnets have, in some way, magnetized or influenced each other. A magnetic field has been created in which each individual magnet has become strengthened because of its place in the community of magnets. Something like that happens when a number of men and women unite to form a Christian congregation. When a number of people are drawn and held together by an intelligent loyalty to a person like Jesus Christ; and when such a community dedicates itself to the cause of the kingdom of God, each individual member of it can be and do what he could not be and do by himself alone. We must not fail to recognize the value of the church in this social sense. Complete salvation for the individual is possible only through his participation in a community that has salvation. The individual who wishes to become an active citizen of the kingdom, and who wishes to make his individual efforts count in the establishing of the kingdom, must affiliate himself with an institution that is dedicated to this end. In this sense, the church, or some other institution that dedicates itself to the cause of the kingdom, is indispensable to both individual and social salvation.

And, finally, in her efforts to create an environment in which men will be encouraged and helped to be good, the church must reach out into the community. The many people in the comunity who are outside of the church, and the many in the church who are out of touch with her life and teaching, can be influenced only as the christianizing influence of the church penetrates beyond her own borders. I see no prospect of any decided increase either in the membership of the church or in the matter of church attendance, in the near future. The hope of

the church lies in the projection of herself and her influence into the community, rather than in drawing the community into herself. There are many people who must be christianized, if christianized at all, through the christianizing of the community itself.

II

CHRISTIANIZING THE COMMUNITY

The christianizing of the individual is our primary task. But the average individual cannot be made Christian and kept Christian unless we christianize the community of which he is an organic part. Individual and social salvation are inseparable. Society cannot be regenerated apart from the individual units that compose it; and the individual units cannot be completely regenerated apart from the regeneration of society itself. Complete salvation is a matter of individual and social action and reaction.

The Influence of Environment.—Science, long ago, called our attention to the importance of environment as a factor in the development of life. Long and careful experimentation proved environment to be the chief factor in the evolution of the lower forms of life. Charles Darwin, by means of forty years of patient experimentation, proved that environment is the controlling factor in the origin and development of the different animal species. Botanists have proved that environment is the prime factor in the growth and variation of plants. Psychology and the social sciences have furnished convincing evidence that environment is one of the paramount factors in the culture of human life as well as of the life of the plant and the animal, and in the culture of the soul as well as of the body. The evidence of psychological and biological experimentation favors the opinion that environment outweighs all the other determin-

able factors. In many cases the environment seems to determine the strength and direction of the will. Environment is, so far as present scientific tests can determine, the chief architect of human destiny. The leading social workers in this country and in Europe agree with the conclusions of experimental science on this point. Jacob Riis, after long and intimate acquaintance with the children of New York's slums, said: "The environment counts 90%"; and later added: "make it 99%."

Mr. Riis no doubt overstated the case when he said that environment counts 99% in the unfolding of the life even of the children of the slums. There is no known universal law or principle that controls human destiny as the law of gravitation is conceded to govern the movements of physical bodies. The higher the being, the more mysterious and indeterminable elements there are in its behavior. Darwin, followed by Weisman, held that acquired habits and characteristics are not transmissible through procreation. Their theory has not been disproved by later and more accurate experimentation. But it does not follow from this fact, as many have assumed, that all normal human beings are born so nearly alike that you can put them under the same environmental influences and through the same environmental processes and be sure of similar results. Such is not the case. That the native endowment of the individual (the embryonic material of which the organism is formed and the way the material is organized before birth) is an important factor in the determining of human destiny, was shown by the investigations of Francis Galton, the noted English biologist and anthropologist. Galton, assisted by a number of scientific co-workers in Europe and America, made a scientific study of twins in the interest of a more exact knowledge of the mysterious forcees of human life. Only twins of the same sex were studied, because being conceived at the same instant of time and formed under identical conditions in the same sac of the uterus, they

are as nearly alike in their pre-natal environment and in their ancestral inheritance as any two individuals can be. The comparative study of the unfolding of their lives will reveal the influence of life-forces which the study of other individuals does not reveal. The scientific study of many pairs of twins, born and reared under the most diverse conditions, proved that the native endowment of the individual is a factor that must be reckoned with seriously in our theorizing about human life and conduct.[1] Galton's later studies of family characteristics confirmed the correctness of his former position.[2]

That the native endowment of the individual is an important factor in the life of the individual is confirmed by the records of the more recent mental tests and measurements. These tests show that the children of the same parents, even twins of the same sex, are not born with the same mental ability, or with the same likes and dislikes. Putting them under the identical environmental influences and through the identical environmental processes, will not produce identical results. This is a fact that must be taken into account not only in our theory of individual conduct and destiny, but also in our theory of social organization. Government of the people cannot be grounded in the doctrine that all normal human beings are born about equal, and that placed in an equally favorable environment they will all be equally able and equally good. That is not true.

But after all the evidence in favor of this or of that theory of human conduct and destiny is weighed, the consensus of the scientific opinion of the last fifty years is that the environmental factor is the most important of all the forces that enter into the shaping of human destiny. We can say with *certainty*: that whatever native ability an individual may have can be brought to full

[1] cf. Galton, Inquiries into Human Faculty, especially the chapter on Twins.

[2] cf. Galton, Natural Inheritance.

and fruitful exercise only under favorable environmental conditions. This, perhaps, is more true of the individual's moral life than it is of his mental or physical life. Where the environment is bad it is not only difficult to get men to accept Christ, but it is more difficult still for them to live Christ if they do accept him. A man from the "red light district," converted at an evangelistic meeting, and compelled to go back to the "red light district" and among his "red light" associates to earn his daily bread and to seek his necessary recreation, has a slim chance to remain converted. Modern science has cast doubt even upon the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints in a community that is complacently left to the devil. We can say with *certainty*: that certain classes of people cannot be regenerated apart from the regeneration of their environment. The theological doctrine of salvation through supernatural agencies has kept the church from taking this information of science with the seriousness that it deserves.

Constructive Community Redemption Begins with the Home.—The first thing in a constructive program of community redemption that demands the serious attention of the church, and of all far-sighted social reformers, is the *family,* or *the home.* The family is the cell, or structural unit, of the social organism. Society, like the physical body, cannot be healthier than the structural cells that compose it. The community cannot be better than the sum total of its families or homes. A number of bad homes may infect a whole community, physically and morally. It is usually among the over-worked, underfed, and poorly housed people that tuberculosis, infantile paralysis, and a number of other communicable diseases have their lair, from whence they spread into the community at large. In the same way a few immoral homes may infect scores of individuals in the community. In her efforts to conserve the life of the people the church

must be vitally concerned about the homes in which they live. She must try to counteract everything that threatens the physical health and the moral integrity of the home. The kingdom of God cannot make progress in a community where home-life is at low ebb.

There are many things in our modern life that threaten the family, and that militate against a wholesome and elevating home-life. There are many people, from widely different walks of life, and from wholly different motives, who advocate the abolition of the individual home and the Christian family. A certain class of social reformers oppose the Christian family on the ground that it is an economic evil. Some hold that it is merely a legal means of perpetuating large and ill-gotten fortunes. By bequeathing immense fortunes to the tenth and the twentieth generation of the same family stock, the money is withheld from the community from whence it originally came. Others oppose the individual home on the ground of its economic wastefulness. These agitators advocate "free love" instead of legal marriage; and they recommend community nurseries instead of homes to take care of the children.

We know that the family has frequently been made a means of holding on to vast fortunes from generation to generation of undeserving individuals. But a better way to prevent this particular social evil than the abolition of the family, would be the passing of a law making it impossible for parents to bequeath to their children—often altogether unworthy and undeserving children—vast sums of money which by right belongs to the community. And we also know that the keeping up of so many individual homes is a wasteful thing economically. A great deal of heat, light, furniture, etc., could be saved if the children were cared for in community nurseries. Five hundred children could be fed more economically in one institution than in one hundred and fifty individual homes. And many people who are now employed in non-

productive house-hold duties in the many individual homes, could be employed in productive pursuits. In very many cases also the abolition of the individual home would be a distinct moral gain. It is evident that a good community institution could furnish better physical, mental, and moral training for its inmates than multitudes of our present homes are furnishing. But neither the charge of economical wastefulness, nor that of the moral and social inefficiency of many of our present homes, is the final word in the argument for or against the individual home. Nothing else can ever take the place of parental love wisely directed. No state institution can ever do for children what a good home will do. And for the developing of efficient homes the kingdom of God bids us labor.

Another class of people, among them not a few of our modern authors and artists, oppose the Christian idea of the family from an altogether different angle. They chafe under the binding marriage that underlies the present family. They rebel against the idea that the parties who make the marriage contract should not have the right to break it when the union is no longer congenial or desirable. They advocate the abolition of the Christian family on the ground that the union of a man and a woman which they are not free to sever when it pleases them to do so, is an infringement on individual liberty, and stands in the way of the highest self-realization. They advocate trial matches instead of legal marriages; and hireling nurses are to take the place of the mother in case there should be any children. Only the other day the papers reported that one of our popular authors, a woman whose stories are read by many thousands of American people, has been secretly married for five years to a prominent pianist and musical composer. The wedding was intended as "a trial match" for one year, but the union has been so congenial that it has not yet been broken. Here are some of the agree-

ments of the "trial match:" "Two breakfasts together a week are to be considered sufficient; children, if any, should bear the paternal name until they reach the years of discretion, when they may make their own choice; the wife retains her own name; marriage is not to interfere with the studies or pursuits of either party; husband and wife will live separately, maintaining separate quarters, meeting per 'inclination' not 'per duty'; neither party will have to account for the time spent away from the other," etc. Much of our modern fiction is tainted by this kind of thing. The anti-social spirit of "the trial match" and self-divorcement is insidiously promulgated through the pages of fiction and the films of the moving picture. It is needless to say that the kingdom of God will not come in an atmosphere like that.

Another enemy of the home is the pagan commercialism which controls so much of our life. Modern industry has contributed much to home-life by taking work out of the dwelling house and doing it in mills and factories. The modern house is cleaner and more conducive to home-life than the house of the pre-industrial age, which was both workshop and home. But what industry has contributed to home-life by taking work out of the house and doing it in factories, it has nullified in many other ways. For the sake of profit modern industry has been tying men and women to machines for ten and twelve hours a day, and often for seven days of the week, thus leaving little time and still less energy for real home-life. For the sake of profit it has demanded a maximum amount of work for a minimum wage, which, in many cases has necessitated under-feeding, scanty clothing, poor housing, and frequently has driven the wife and mother and the children of tender years, into the mills to help increase the family income. The commercial spirit which values big rents above healthy children, has been substituting tenements, apartments, and flats for single houses. All these things

6415

mean the physical, mental and moral deterioration of many homes.

Any attempt at social rebuilding that fails to aim at a physically, mentally, and morally efficient parenthood, and a sanctified home-life, fails to square with the requirements of the religion of the kingdom of God. The home must be made to function at its best if individuals and society shall be brought to that point of efficiency and well-being which the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God implies.

Fundamental Requisities of an Effcient Home-life.— The kind of home which the kingdom of God implies presupposes *Christian marriage.* This, however, means more than the formal sanction of the church. Christian marriage implies the closest and most sacred union of personalities that can be formed. "The twain shall become one flesh." It is the union through which two personalities are to realize their own highest and best selves, and through which they are to make their best contribution to society. The union is, for this social reason, the most binding relationship that can be entered. "A man shall forsake his father and mother, and cleave to his wife." According to the records of Mark and Luke the union is indissoluble. Nothing but death can relieve either party of the obligation.[1] According to Matthew the union can be severed only on the ground of the sexual infidelity of one of the contracting parties.[2]

No other teaching of Jesus has been criticized so much as his insistence on the indissolubleness of the marriage relation. To enforce his teachings literally would undoubtedly result in many hardships. There are cases where divorce is clearly the lesser of two evils both so far as the individuals in the affair and society itself are concerned. No reasonable person would dispute this.

[1] Mark 10, 2-12; Luke 16-18.
[2] Matt. 5, 31-32; 19, 3-11.

But Jesus' lofty view of marriage, and his uncompromising attitude toward the easy-going divorce of his day, will appear less offensive to the modern conscience when we approach the subject from the social rather than from the individual angle. Christian marriage concerns society as well as the bride and the bridegroom. There are three contracting parties in a real marriage: the bride, the bridegroom, and society. These three parties are mutually concerned in the wedding contract, and they must continue to be mutually concerned about the successful and happy perpetuating of the contract. The marital union does not exist for the pleasure or the convenience of a man and a woman, but for the perpetuating of society—for the rearing and training of children to take their place in society. Whenever a marriage fails society suffers as well as the bride and the bridegroom. Children cannot be trained to take their place in the kind of society that the kingdom of God implies under a system of trial marriage and easy divorce. Society, for whose perpetuation the marital union exists, should enter more conscientiously and intelligently into the wedding contract and into the perpetuating of the contract —into the granting of the license which legalizes the union and into the granting of divorce which legalizes the breaking up of the union. There is no question that a reckless attitude toward marriage such as characterizes our own day, or an easy-going divorce such as characterized Jesus' day, results in more unnecessary hardships for individuals and in more evils for society than would result from the enforcement of Jesus' rigid attitude toward the matter. If we will try, we may find a satisfactory mean between the seemingly rigid attitude of Jesus and the extremely reckless attitude of the mass of the people. If individuals and society shall attain the standard of the kingdom of God marriage must be brought to the point of highest efficiency, and divorce must be reduced to a minimum.

Christian marriage, which looks to the moral supplementation of two personalities and to the rearing of children for society, and which, for these social reasons, is to be the most indissoluble of all unions, presupposes *thoughtful courtship.* This holiest and most binding of all human relationships must not be entered without serious thought. The thoughtlessness with which the marriage relationship is entered is one of the outstanding social evils of our day. Many a man shows more care in the selection of his automobile, and many a woman is more exercised over the selection of her wardrobe, than they are in the selection of their life-partner. This is one reason for the failure of so many marriages.

Christian marriage presupposes, finally, *a pure relationship between the sexes before and after marriage.* The holy ends of Christian marriage are difficult to attain where the community sanctions a loose and unclean relationship between the sexes. The most basic and, therefore, the most inviolable of all human relationships is that of sex, for the very perpetuation of society depends upon it. Not only the welfare and happiness of the individual home, but of society itself, demands the most intelligent and moral public sentiment on this basic matter. It is a duty of the highest individual and social significance that the home, the church, and the schools should coöperate in creating the most wholesome public sentiment that is possible on marriage and on all the relationships which Christian marriage presupposes.

We should bear in mind then that the Christian home exists for social ends, and not for the convenience or the pleasure of the individual parties to the contract. It exists for the sake of children,—for the training of children for their efficient participation in society. This imposes upon the individual home, and upon the community of which the home is an organic part, certain very sacred obligations. The training of children for efficient

participation in society implies a number of things to which we have given too little thought and care.

The child that is to participate efficiently in the kind of society that the kingdom of God implies must, first of all, *be well born.* This is the first social right of the child,—a right which many are being denied. We have been altogether too lax in the matter of eugenics, or good breeding, as it applies to the human species. We have given much thought to the breeding of our pedigreed animals; but we have been criminally careless in the conception and birth of children. Multitudes of children are born each year, who are disqualified for life because the plain laws of eugenics were utterly disregarded. The world is full of crippled and incompetent people, a burden to themselves and to society, whose chief or only fault is that they were ill-born. They are crippled, or otherwise handicapped for life, because they were born of diseased parents; or because they were conceived at a time and under conditions when the law of eugenics warns against conception.

We have known for a long time that the sin of sexual excess or indiscretion is visited upon the innocent children as well as upon the guilty parents. Venereal disease has been the cause of more human misery than any other malady known to man. In its most malignant form it not only spells doom for the guilty man or woman, but it is visited with frightful consequences upon the innocent children unto the third and fourth generation. The testimony of practicing physicians as to the number of venereally diseased patients who come to them for treatment, and the probable number who doctor themselves, is both shocking and alarming. The medical records of the army have confirmed the testimony of the practicing physicians as to the appalling prevalence of this disease. I heard a prominent physician state that the army officials fear venereal diseases more than pneumonia or typhoid fever or the enemy's bullets. The government, during the late war, put up a valiant fight to control venereal dis-

ease in the army and navy. And while we do not doubt that the methods which were adopted were the best for army purposes, under the conditions that surrounded the encampments, we believe that it would be unwise to adopt the same methods of venereal control among the civilian population.

The first public safeguard against this social scourge is not an anti-toxin that will make the individual, who is guilty of illicit sexual intercourse, immune from sexual disease, but a strong individual and public sentiment against all sexual irregularity and excess. And in addition to a more wholesome public sentiment, which we know will not be sufficient to control completely the deep-rooted racial desire for sexual gratification, we should place all venereally diseased persons under as strict a quarantine as we do the victim of small pox or diphtheria. While this might cause a few innocent persons to suffer, it is a social need of such importance that the few lesser evils that it might cause should be overlooked for social ends. It should be made impossible for any one to marry while suffering from any venereal disease. And in addition to all other possible safeguards, we should spare no efforts to uproot from our communities the houses of prostitution, and every form of professional harlotry, which we know to be the chief sources of the perennial contamination.

We have also known for a long time that the excessive use of alcoholic beverages is visited upon the children and the children's children with very baneful results. The children of habitual drunkards, like the children of venereally diseased parents, are, as a rule, physically and mentally disqualified to compete with their better born neighbors in the stern battle of life. But our municipalities have been continuing the saloon all these years in spite of our knowledge of the frightful wreckage it has been making of child-life.

And only recently we learned that the fatigue toxin,

which is the peculiar product of our modern sped-up industry and of our sped-up dissipation, has a most serious effect on the children of the parents whose systems have been thoroughly poisoned by this virus. Careful investigations, especially among the factory workers of Italy, has shown that the mortality rate of the children of mothers who, in their girlhood, worked long hours in factories, is much greater than it is among the children of mothers who never did any constantly fatiguing work. And the children of these fatigue-poisoned mothers, in case they live through the critical period of infancy, are lighter in weight and physically weaker, and thus a readier prey for disease germs, than the children of the mothers who, in their girlhood and later, were not the victims of long hours of monotonous toil in unsanitary mills and factories. In this way modern industry has been mortgaging the future of society by dooming great multitudes of children before they are born.

The law of eugenics is clear, and it is as stern and as unmerciful as it is clear. The child that is to grow into the highest type of man,—the type of man who can participate efficiently in such a society as the kingdom of God implies,—must be well born. The institutions that are interested in a better and more efficient manhood, and in a better social order, must begin their labors here at the fountain source,—here in the home where life begins, where the foundations are laid and the first impressions made.

To grow into the type of man that the kingdom of God implies the child must not only be well born, but also *well reared.* This is the second social right of the child, —a right which multitudes of the innocents are being denied. The proper nurture of the child implies religious training. The church has done well in the past to emphasize the religious training of the child both in the home and in the church. One of the most encouraging things in the church at the present time is the revival of interest

in the moral and religious training of the children. But there are other absolutely essential things in the training of the child about which the church has concerned herself too little. In order to build the mental, moral, and religious superstructure which the kingdom of God implies, a basis must be laid for it in *sufficient wholesome food, clothing, and shelter.* Where this basis is wanting the superstructure cannot be reared. One of the saddest things in our social life is the fact that every large community in rich America has its multitudes of innocent children who are denied these first requisites of life.

Investigations made recently in two of our metropolitan cities revealed the painful fact that great numbers of children in these fabulously wealthy communities are coming to school hungry day after day. Many children (usually where the mothers are employed in mills or factories) bring a penny instead of lunch, and with the penny buy a pickle, a candy stick, or some crackers. The child who comes to school hungry morning after morning, and who lunches on a pickle, a candy stick, or a cracker, has a slim chance to grow into a strong and healthy man or woman, such as the kingdom of God implies that its citizens shall be. The investigators reported four primary causes of this deplorable state of affairs: (1) drunkenness; (2) indifference and criminal carelessness of parents; (3) ignorance and helplessness of parents; and (4) wages inadequate to purchase sufficient wholesome food, a condition which, in many cases, has driven the mothers into the mills to help increase the family income, thus greatly aggravating the otherwise bad home conditions by taking the mother away from the children the greater part of the day.

The churches of the community should not be ignorant of such conditions; and they dare not be indifferent to them if they know them. If the liquor business helps to send children to school hungry every morning we dare not rest until the social curse is removed from the community.

Parents who are able to care for their children but are too bad or too indifferent to do so, should be compelled to do it. Such chastisement is a right that belongs to the community. Parents who do not know how to take care of their children should have our help. Adequate instruction in the art of home-keeping and the science of child-nurture should be a part of the educational program of the community. And business that could pay a living wage to its employees but refuses to do so, should have the curse of Almighty God pronounced upon it.

In the New Republic of a few months ago the startling statement was made, on the authority of Dr. Thomas D. Wood, chairman of the Commission of Health Problems in Education, National Council of Education, that 20% of the American school children—4,500,000—are suffering from malnutrition. Dr. William R. P. Emmerson, an eminent Boston authority, places the number of improperly nourished children even higher than Dr. Wood. These figures are not the exaggerations of social agitators, but the report to the Federal Children's Bureau of the findings and opinions of two impartial scientists. The chief causes which these men assigned for this appalling state of affairs are *poverty* and *ignorance.*

Whatever the cause or the causes may be, there is something seriously wrong somewhere so long as such conditions exist. It is usually among the ill-born and under-nourished children that the mentally backward children are found. And from these same ranks will come large accessions to the morally and socially delinquent youths and adults. Science has discovered a very close connection between under-nourishment and mental and moral delinquency. There is a sub-surface connection between our scanty breakfast tables and our reformatories and jails. Here is an unoccupied field for religious service. It is the duty of the churches to be vitally interested in the condition of child life in their respective communities. It is certain that the kingdom of God cannot come, as it

should come, in a community of ill-born and undernourished children. The kingdom of God is seriously obstructed in a community where poverty and ignorance, carelessness and indifference, are making such havoc of child life. The children of to-day are the material out of which the kingdom of God must be built to-morrow.

To be well-reared also implies *adequate housing.* Here the modern city faces a social problem the gravity of which too few seem to realize. No other single factor is a more serious menace to the American family at the present time than the bad housing conditions of our rapidly growing cities. A clean house, with enough rooms of adequate dimensions, with plenty of fresh air and sunlight, is an absolute necessity in child nurture. A high-bred colt will be stunted in a bad stable; and so will a child. Here in America, where God has blessed us with an abundance of ground on which to build, there should be no occasion for the many multiple dwellings,—flats, tenements, apartments,—where individuals are herded together like cattle in a box-car. But in spite of the abundance of ground the people of our American cities are compelled to live as cramped as the people in the old centers of civilization in Europe and Asia. I will give a few examples of housing conditions that were reported recently by investigating commissions. Similar conditions can be found in every large city in the United States, and in many of our smaller cities and towns.

This is the report of what was found in the neighborhood of one of the large steel mills of Pittsburgh, Pa. "In one apartment a man, his wife and baby, and two boarders, slept in one room, and five boarders occupied two beds in an adjoining room. . . . Not one house in the entire settlement had provision for drinking water for its tenants. . . . They went to an old pump in the mill yard, 360 steps from the farthest apartment, and down 75 stairs. This town pump was the sole supply of drinking water within reach of 91 households, comprising 568

persons. . . . Another row of one-family houses had a curious wooden chute arrangement on the back porches, down which waste water was poured that ran through open drains in the rear yard to the open drains between this row of houses and the next. . . . They carried other things besides waste water—filth of every description was emptied down these chutes, for these six families and three families below on the first floor had no closet accommodations, and were living like animals." [1]

This is a paragraph from an appeal which a home missionary, in one of our large cities, made to the Official Board of his church: "In speaking of the homes from which these children come, I hardly think that we should recognize them as such. One home that I am thinking of consists of one room, in which a bed and a couch are on one side, the cook stove at the foot end of the bed, and a table on the other side; no rug or carpet, and equally as much grease as anything else. The gas burns all the time because it is so dark. One of our kindergarten children comes from this home. There is no yard, and no place to play but on the street, or in this one room. Most of the children are brought up in similar surroundings. In a good many homes the mother is obliged to work in the factory. She takes the children out of bed and brings them to the nursery—I dare say without breakfast. They play around until nine o'clock, when the other children come in for the morning kindergarten." How can we hope to rear American citizens, to say nothing of citizens of the kingdom of God, under such conditions?

The Philadelphia newspapers reported recently that the Philadelphia Housing Commission had investigated 8,334 dwelling houses and had pronounced the majority of them "wholly unfit for human habitation." One of the best authorities on the housing problem in the United States says that housing conditions in New York City

[1] Painters Row, Elizabeth Crowell, Charities and Commons, Feb. 6, 1909, Vol. 21, pp. 899–910.

make real home-life impossible for 1,000,000 people.

But we need not go to the big city to find iniquitous housing conditions. They exist in every industrial center in rich America. A member of our own Home Mission Board, working under the directions of the Federal Council of Churches, investigated housing conditions about the Bethlehem steel mills, South Bethlehem, Pa., and he reported conditions as appalling as those found about the steel mills of Pittsburgh. It is estimated that at least 5,000,000 of our American people are living in houses that are "wholly unfit for human habitation." When the mayor of one of our large cities recently told a mob of strikers to go home and behave themselves, they gave the grim reply: "We have no homes to go to." It is useless to tell people to go home and behave themselves when they have nothing that can be called a home. Preaching the Gospel will have no effect on these people until we first regenerate our method of housing them. It is estimated that 10,000,000 more of our American people live in apartments and flats in which a sanctified home-life is exceedingly difficult, and in very many cases quite impossible. Many families are crowded together where the privacy and the comfort which real home-life demands are not possible.

A new feature of the housing problem from which practically every urban community in America is suffering is the hasty and wholly inadequate reconstruction of single dwelling houses into flats and apartments. Houses that were built twelve or fifteen years ago for one family are now being converted into flats for three or four families. A single floor, with no provision for family conveniences and comforts is renting for as much as the whole house rented for six years ago. In many cases there dare be no children, for the law of the house forbids them; and in other cases there should be none, for conditions prevent their proper care and nurture. Right here is one of the most serious menaces to our American family life. It is

a serious matter for a community when there are no housing facilities for children. Here is the modern Herod slaying the innocents. The Gospel that has nothing to say about such things is not the Gospel of the kingdom of God. The religion that is ignorant of or unconcerned about such vital matters as these has no mission in our modern life.

The fundamental source of the housing trouble is the fact that the controlling object in our city planning and building has always been money, not men. We have been planning and building our cities, not with the idea of growing strong, healthy people, but with the idea of profit for certain classes of people. One class of citizens has been allowed to monopolize the building ground in the direction in which the city must grow, and to inflate the price of the ground to enrich themselves. The land speculators have bought up all the desirable building ground for half a mile, and at some places for more than a mile, beyond the Western limits of my own city. The future streets are already staked off. In some places the curbs are placed. One of our future streets is already asphalted, while streets on which scores of children find their only open place to play do not even have the gutters cleaned. Everything possible is done to induce the city to grow in the direction of the ground held by the speculators. But the object is not the future welfare of the citizens of Allentown, but profit for the individual speculators. By the time the city must have the ground for building purposes, a twenty foot lot will cost half as much as an ordinary house should cost. This monopolizing of the available building ground by private parties is a social evil that is practiced in every growing community in the country. The land-improvement companies have been looked upon as benefactors, whereas in many communities, they have been a social evil. Another class of citizens has practically monopolized the building trade in most American cities, and has been erecting the kind of houses that

mean most profit for the builders, rather than the kind that are most conducive to family life. The landlord class has entrenched itself everywhere. They have been inflating the price of real estate and boosting the rents. During the last few years profiteering in rents in most American cities has been scandalous. The landlords have been taking advantage of the congested conditions of our cities and have been reaping a harvest in rents. They have been turning the red blood corpuscles of innocent children into glittering gold for themselves. In most cities there is a surprising number of real estate agents, most of whom are making a fat living playing into the hands of the land-speculators and the landlords. The results of these practices have been inflated real estate values, exorbitant rents, and the consequent crowding of the poor into close and unhealthy quarters. If we were moved by the kingdom-ideals, which place men above real estate, and human comforts and welfare above big rents, these things would not be so.

The solution of the housing problem is not an impossible one; and, in communities where there is plenty of available building ground, it should not be a very difficult one. A few European and Asiatic municipalities have gone a great way toward solving the problem. It has been along the line of municipal socialism. In such case the city buys the necessary building ground for what it is really worth; and improves it with the idea of serving the people. The city builds the houses, and does so with the idea of growing children in them. The city acts in the capacity of landlord and real estate agent, and either sells the houses to its citizens at cost, or rents them for the actual amount of interest on the original cost of the building, plus the cost of the upkeep of the property. In a few cases, the city also owns and operates the transportation lines. The lines are run for the sake of service to the public, not for profit for private parties. This makes it possible for the city to be built along the ground, instead of into the

air. Many of the people move into the suburbs, or into the open country, where they can have gardens and fresh air, and still be carried to their places of work in the city for a reasonable fare. Where the socializing of the housing problem has been given a fair trial it has resulted in better and cheaper houses. In Sydney and Melbourne, in Australia, and in one or two of the towns of New Zealand, houses rented, just before the war, for from one-sixth to one-seventh of the average working man's income, while here in the United States the rent, at that time, was taking from one-fifth to one-fourth of the working man's income.

The kingdom of God is a social order of the highest possible type of citizenship; and that implies dwelling houses in which a sanctified home-life is possible, and in which children can be properly reared and nurtured. Interest in the dwelling houses of the community is just as much a piece of kingdom service as interest in the community's church buildings.

And, finally, if the community shall be made up of the kind of citizens that the kingdom of God implies, *an efficient-living income must be made possible for every family.* Much of the average city family's life revolves around the weekly or monthly pay-envelope. In the case of many families the contents of the pay-enevelope determine whether the children shall be adequately nourished, clothed, housed and schooled. To me no other sin seems so great and so deplorable as the fact that here in America, the land of superabundance, so many good, honest, hard-working families are doomed to live on less than we know to be necessary to live life at its best.

Shortly before the war the Federal Government ordered investigations in several states to determine, as near as possible, the amount of income necessary to assure an efficient living for a family composed of husband and wife and three children under working age. At the same time a number of similar investigations were made by certain

individuals who were interested in this vital matter. The conclusions reached in these studies ranged from $600 to $1400 as the amount needed, at that time, to make efficient living possible for an American family of five. I gathered material for one of these studies; and I was one of those who placed the necessary amount for efficient living at $1400. I was quite sure that not one of the investigators considered anything less than that amount sufficient for himself and family to live "efficiently and happily." A smaller sum might do for the other fellow, but not for ourselves. But in the kingdom of God that which will not do for ourselves must not be made to do for others. While the different investigating committees never compromised on the matter, the feeling somehow became quite common that $750 was officially considered sufficient for five people to live efficiently and happily in the average American community.

About the same time that these inquiries were being conducted in different communities, Professor Willford Isbell King, of the University of Wisconsin, was making a study of the distribution of the wealth and income of the people of the United States. In that study Professor King made the surprising disclosure that the income of 38.92% of the families of the United States was less than $700, and of 26.08% of the families it was less than $600 a year.[1] That means that during the decade before the war from one-fourth to one-one-third of all the families in the country were living on less than the minimum requirement for efficiency and happiness. The income of more than one-fourth of all the families, at that time, was not sufficient to secure the wholesome food, the necessary clothing, the proper shelter, the schooling, etc., that efficient living demands. Their income allowed no luxuries. But the life that is denied all luxuries is hardly worth living. Nothing could be laid aside for the proverbial "rainy

[1] See: The Wealth and Income of the People of the United States, Table 49, p. 228.

day." It meant a hand-to-mouth living. As long as the head of the family remains well and his job lasts, the family will be kept from real poverty. But an accident, or prolonged unemployment, will push such a family over the border into the barren wilderness of want. One-fourth of all the families of rich America only a hand's breadth from real poverty! What a state of affairs!

But some one will say that these figures of conditions prior to 1914 do not represent conditions as they are to-day. Perhaps they do not. But, on the whole, things have not changed much for the better for the average poor family since 1914. In the average commmunity family incomes have hardly kept pace with the increase of family expenses. The most recent reliable studies of the necessary income for a family of five to live efficiently and happily have placed the amount at $1696. And if efficient living shall mean enough wholesome food, warm and decent-looking clothing, a comfortable house in which to live, and adequate school privileges for the children, plus a little something for religion and necessary recreation, $1696 are not too much. But what percentage of our families are getting that amount? According to the report of the Internal Revenue Bureau, a few more than 4,000,000 heads of families filed income tax returns for 1919. It is quite safe to infer from this that at least 20,000,000 families had a balance of $2000 or less after the legal deductions were made. In 1920 there were fewer returns than in 1919. It is altogether probable that one-fourth of all the families in the country to-day as in 1914 are living on less than the minimum amount required for efficient living.

It is true that under present conditions not enough is produced to give everybody an efficient-living income. But there is no reason why civilization should continue to be conducted on the basis of an annual deficit. Professor Simon N. Patten, of the University of Pennsylvania, in his book: "The New Basis of Civilization,"

shows very forcibly that with the present scientific control of nature enough could be produced in the United States to furnish an efficient and happy living for all of us. Reliable studies since his time have proved beyond a doubt that if adequate production instead of maximum profit were the object of our industrial system enough could be produced in the United States to pay a just interest on all invested capital, to give a just remuneration for all special services and skill, and still leave enough for every honest family to live an efficient and happy life.

Adequate production of the means of life and the equitable distribution of what is produced are among the most pressing problems that are awaiting solution. These are matters that affect not only the bodies of the individual citizens, but their souls as well. These are things that touch every phase of our individual and social life. Until these problems are solved many other kingdom-problems must remain unsolved.

The Kingdom-Program of Christianization Touches Every Phase of the Community's Life.— The work of constructive christianization begins with the individual, and with the home which makes the first and the deepest impression on the individual. But our efforts may not end here. There are many things in the average community that must be changed before all individuals and all homes can be made Christian and kept Christian. Just as a number of bad individuals or bad homes may infect a community physically and morally, so there may be things in the community that will corrupt individuals and homes that might otherwise have remained good and pure. The community at large must be as clean as possible, or there will be individuals in it who will not be strong enough to keep clean.

The following paragraphs give the substance of three investigations that were made recently in three well known

and highly respected Christian communities. There is little doubt that similar conditions exist in the average big community throughout the country. These disclosures show very forcibly why so many people are not reached by the church, and also why so many whom we do reach for a while slip away from us again.

A large Vice Commission made up of representative citizens, led by a courageous pastor of a wealthy and influential congregation, made a thorough investigation of a particular social evil in a city that is considered a very desirable place in which to live. What was found appalled the good people of the community. They did not think that such things could exist right around them in their fair city. But they did exist. The Commission reported that there was a professional harlot for every 150 of the adult male population of the city. In addition to these professional prostitutes, there were many "street-walkers" and other immoral women, who solicited their illicit trade on the streets of the city and in every public place that was open to them. The upwards of sixty-five houses of prostitution were patronized by approximately 4000 or 5000 men each week in a city whose total population is only about 65,000. A number of saloons were found open on Sundays as well as week days, and some of them were regularly harboring professional harlots and lewd women in side rooms. In such a community there will be many individuals who are not strong enough to keep clean. In such a community many a home that might otherwise be happy and prosperous will be ruined. In such a community much of the church's work with individuals will go to waste.

In another city, not far from the city just referred to, a progressive pastor and some of his people in whom the social conscience had been awakened, made a study of the moral and social conditions in the twelve blocks around their church. These are some of the things they found: "37 saloons, or licensed liqour houses; 11 beer clubs, mak-

ing 48 places where intoxicating liquors could be gotten, an average of 4 places to a square, or one for every 30 families. . . . There were twice as many places of evil allurement in this section as churches and Sunday schools." These conditions existed in what is considered a respectable section of a very respectable Pennsylvania city. So long as the places of evil allurement greatly outnumber the institutions of moral and social uplift there will be many individuals who cannot be good, and there will be many homes that will be unhappy.

In a prosperous industrial center of another state a survey was made of a district in which 900 families lived, and it was discovered that 150 of the heads of these families earned only $600 a year (1912), and that 74 heads of families had earned a little less than that amount in that same year. Some of these people worked for a concern that reported, for that year, a semi-annual dividend of 15% on their stock which was estimated to be 25% water. Some of these people were working seven days of the week, and most of them ten hours a day. Many of the dwelling houses in this section were owned by the corporation, and were kept in miserable repair. In this city there were, no doubt, the same temptations found in the other investigations just referred to. Over-worked and under-fed, and surrounded by such temptations, how could they live up to the lofty ideals of Jesus Christ!

Where the good people of the community are ignorant of or indifferent to such conditions as described in these investigations it will remain impossible for many people to be clean and virtuous and good. The "abundant life" of the kingdom of God is not possible under such conditions.

The Need of Adequate Provision for Play and Recreation.—Constructive christianization concerns itself not only with adequate religious and educational opportunities, and with the matter of good housing and living wages,

but also with the vital matter of recreation and amusements.

Every community should be concerned about the opportunity for play for its smaller children. Play is almost as vital a matter in the proper nurture of the child as food and clothing. It answers a vital need in the physical organism. To crush the play-instinct will injure the child, and will ultimately affect his manhood. Where the commercial spirit uses up all the available building ground and piles flat upon flat with no yards in which children can play, the community should equip and superintend public play-grounds where this biological need can be met. A piece of ground, in the congested parts of the city, is worth more as a playground for children than as a factory site. In the conservation of its children ancient Sparta came nearer the ideal of the kingdom of God than most of our modern Christian cities. In the important matter of public playgrounds heathen Japan sets a good example for Christian America.

Every community should furnish adequate opportunity for wholesome recreation for the older boys and girls, and for its men and women. There should be publicly supervised places where the youths of both sexes can meet, and where men and women can congregate in a clean atmosphere, safe from the degrading influences which are associated with much of our present-day recreation and amusement. More people go wrong during the hours of recreation than at any other time. Yet recreation they must and will have. Recreation is a biological need that should be met in the same sane and thoughtful way that we meet the need for education and religion.

The worst feature about our public amusements is that they have become a prey of the commercial spirit. Our public amusements are conducted primarily for the sake of profit for the individual promoters, and with very little, if any, consideration for the welfare of the public. The things that pay best are done, not the things that would be

most beneficial to the public. For this reason all public amusements, and all the means of public recreation, should be socialized. The community, which is interested in the welfare of its people rather than in profit, should look after so vital a matter as public recreation. In the average community during the last fifty years, the saloon, the club house, and the commercialized dance hall, were the only means of rendezvous and of recreation that were open to many people. Jane Addams says that it is for the want of better places to go to that so many of New York's working girls spend their evenings in the commercialized dance halls, many of which are directly connected with the brothel. Having no homes in which to stay, where else shall they go? Much of the life which the church tries to conserve is destroyed in these haunts of Mammon. It will continue to be so until we will close up these commercialized dens and give the people clean and wholesome recreation instead.

There is no longer any doubt that there are many individuals who cannot be saved until we regenerate the community in which they live. And this phase of her christian task the church has shirked.

But What Can the Church Do?.—There is room for an honest difference of opinion as to the part the church should take in the building of a better community. There is a difference of opinion even among the socially minded Christians as to how far the church should go in her efforts to meet specific community needs. Some hold that the church does her full duty when she teaches the kingdom-principles and ideals and urges her members and the citizens of the community to meet the specific social needs; while others have gone so far as to open pool and billiard rooms in the parish house and to conduct dances in the basement of the sanctuary.

But no matter how individual Christians may differ in their opinion as to the church's duty in meeting certain

specific community needs, there are a few fundamental duties about which there can hardly be room for a legitimate difference of opinion. Every social minded person will agree that the church should see and understand the problems of the community,—its social problems as well as its more distinctly religious problems. The church has no right to minister in a community whose people she does not know, and in whose problems she takes no interest. The study and the understanding of her own community is fully as religious and far more important than the study and the understanding of the Galatian or the Macedonian communities of the first century. It is evident that the church cannot shed the light of the Gospel upon problems she does not see. A vital message demands a chart of the community as well as a copy of the Gospels.

And it is equally clear that the church must endeavor to develop a type of Christian individual who will take a vital interest in the welfare of the community,—in its business, its pleasures, its dwelling houses, its streets, its parks, in short in everything that enters into the community's life and welfare. In a well organized community it may not be necessary for the church, as an institution, to engage directly in many community activities. It is primarily through her membership, in whom she must create the social vision and the social conscience, that she must aim to make her social influence felt. The normal relation of the church to the social organism is that of the soul to the body, rather than that of the boatman to the boat. She must help move society in the right direction by an inner impulsion, rather than by external force. There is a parallel, as Professor Mathews has pointed out in one of his books, between the function of an educational institution and that of the Christian church. An educational institution gives instruction and inspiration, but does not of itself undertake to do the things in which it gives instruction. In the main, that is the duty of the Christian church in her relation to the social up-building of the com-

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOG

munity. She must inspire and stimulate her people to do the things that ought to be done. But this implies the developing of a type of Christian individual who differs radically from the typical saints of other ages. It requires the culture of a Christian individual who adds the social passion of the prophet to the piety of the old-type church man.

And, what is more important still, the church must aim to create in the community itself the social vision and the social conscience. It is not enough that a goodly number of individual citizens should have the social conscience; the community itself must have it. It is this thing especially that we mean when we speak about christianizing the community. Communities are not impersonal things, mere aggregations of individuals and buildings, but *super-persons.* The late Professor Royce, of Harvard University, in his last great work: "The Problem of Christianity," points out the fact that there are two grades, or levels, of mental beings in the world: individuals and communities. He says: "A community, when unified by an active, indwelling purpose, is an entity more concrete and less mysterious than an individual man, and can love and be loved like a husband and wife love."

Professor Royce here calls our attention to a fact of the utmost importance for the church. Communities are personal beings—*super-personal beings*—in whom the Christian conscience must be developed. The community itself, as a super-person, must be filled with the kingdom vision, animated by the kingdom ideals, and moved by the kingdom purposes. It is the community thus christianized that will ultimately solve the problems of which we have been speaking.

But what agency shall inspire the community with the kingdom-ideals and purposes if the church will not do it? And how will the church do it if she persists in the notion that nothing but an individual person with arms

and legs and finger nails has any personality? In speaking to our ministerial association, about two years ago, a theological professor ridiculed the idea of christianizing an impersonal thing like a community. He claimed that nothing can be christianized but an individual person. The church, according to his view, must confine herself strictly to the individualistic method of christianizing an individual here and another there, and by and by these christianized individuals will constitute the Christian social order. The professor was sincere, but he was wrong. A community has a personality that is as real, and that is more enduring and important than that of any individual citizen. But it is no easy matter to arouse, to enlighten, and to direct a great super-person, like a community. No Gospel will reach its ear and change its heart but the social Gospel. And the social Gospel will not affect it much unless it is preached and practiced by all the churches of the community. Here and there the social efforts of an individual congregation, or of a single pastor, may arouse a community; but that is the exception, not the rule. The christianizing of our respective communities will require the reconversion of the whole church to the social point of view of the kingdom of God.

And, finally, there are occasions when the church, as an institution, should undertake certain lines of community service.[1] When the community will not do the things that ought to be done; and when no one in the community will do them, the church should undertake to do them herself. Here is where the analogy between the function of an educational institution and that of the church ceases to hold. If, for example, the community will not teach its foreign residents the English language and our American ideals and standards of life, the churches of the

[1] For a very sane discussion of what the church should do in certain backward communities see: Serving the Neighborhood, by Ralph A. Felton.

community should make an effort to do it. Or if the community will take no interest in the matter of wholesome recreation for its young people, the church should, in some way, try to meet the need. It might be better for the church to gather the young people together in her basement and judiciously supervise their dancing than to stand idly by until some unscrupulous persons lay hold of their social instincts and gather them into some public den of iniquity where frequently they are ruined in body and soul, while the church throws up her hands in holy horror and useless protest. That has been her policy too long. She has done very little for the social life of her young people. She has done very little to prevent selfish men and women from preying and profiteering on the social instincts of our youths—very little but scold and protest after it was too late to undo what might have been avoided. The church need not fear that she will despiritualize herself by doing anything in the interest of human welfare. Nor will she thereby depart from the will of him who blessed the marriage feast, attended the Pharisee's banquet, and enjoyed the air and the sunlight on the blue waters of Galilee.

III

CHRISTIANIZING THE NATION

Christianizing the nation implies more than the recruiting of the individual citizens for the church, and building the country full of churches to which these evangelized individuals may come to worship God in case nothing more interesting claims their attention. If all the citizens of the country could be made members of the church the country might still not be Christian. There was a time when the conversion and baptism of the chief ruler of a nation or a province implied the conversion of all his subjects. A nominally Christian nation was thus born in a day. But such a superficial transaction left

the nation as unchristian as it was before. A nation is not Christian until its conduct in all its relationships squares with the ethical standards of the kingdom of God.

Two Blunders of the Church in her Relation to the State.—The church of the past made two serious mistakes in her relation to the state. The first mistake was made by the Catholic church, and the second by the Protestant church.

In her lust for the balance of power the Catholic church aimed at the control of the state. Through long periods of political gambling,—a gambling more corrupt than any that ever disgraced Tammany Hall,—the popes and their coadjutors succeeded in usurping the functions of the state. They made and unmade kings. But this political game was not played with the idea of christianizing the state, but for the purpose of empowering the church. The result was the degeneration of both the church and the state. It led to that political trickery and that moral corruption of the church at which many thoughtful people revolted. It led to the widespread loss of faith not only in the church, but in religion itself.

In so far as the Catholic church was honest in her desire to control the state, she was misled by a confusion of her sphere and her function. There is an essential difference between the sphere of an organism and its function. The sphere is the field in which it works, while the function is the work which it performs in this given field. While the sphere of the church, as an instrument of the kingdom of God, is the wide world, it does not follow that she should actually operate the affairs of the world. The fact that the church has a message for politics, for industry, and for science, does not mean that she should seize the reins of government, and should operate industry, and teach science. The church once lost her soul

trying to run the state for her own benefit. She must not make that mistake again.

The second mistake was made by the Protestant church. In her reaction from the errors of the Catholic church, the evangelical Protestant church swung to the extreme opposite position where she left the state blissfully alone. The practical consequences of this mistake were almost as disastrous for the kingdom of God as were those of the Catholic error. It was a sad day in the history of Protestant Christianity when the separation of church and state resulted in the divorce of God and religion from politics.

In some sections of Europe the Protestant attitude of hands off resulted in a speedy reaction in favor of the state. The state again became the sovereign power, while the Protestant church became a mere dependent. She functioned as a tool of the state. The state built the churches, and supported the preachers and the theological professors; and, it was only natural that the state, which was so gracious to the church, should reserve the right to silence any teaching or preaching that was not in strict accord with its sovereign will. There is no surprise at all at the fact that the state churches of Europe have had so little christianizing influence on the nations of which they are a part.

In other sections, the separation of church and state resulted in each travelling its own way and attending to what was considered its own business. Religion and politics were considered two entirely different departments of life; and the church was to attend to the one and the state to the other. The sermon on the mount and the ten commandments were meant for the church, but not for the senate chamber. To "love thy neighbor as thyself" was a good thing to preach about in the church, but it was a precept that did not concern the state. This divorce of religion from politics was detrimental to both

the church and the state. The church took good men out of the world and unfitted them for political life. The pious church man would have nothing to do with politics. The more pious the man the less inclined he would be to meddle in so corrupt and corrupting a thing as politics. The result was that non-church men were left to run the state. Or, what was just as bad, since religion and politics are two essentially different departments of life and must not get mixed up, the church men who entered politics left their religion at home with their wives and babies. Their theology did not make them see the contradiction between being a good church man on Sundays, and a corrupt politician on week days. The corruption of politics kept many good people out of political life; and the fact that so many good people remained out of political life still further corrupted politics.

The first step in the Christianizing of the Nation.—The first thing the church must do in her efforts to make the nation Christian is to fill her own membership and the citizens of her immediate community with a keen sense of their political duty and responsibility. Government is one of the most fundamental of social disciplines. Until the millennium comes there will be need of stable government of some kind. The members of the church must be made to feel their duty to a discipline so fundamental as government. The church must take just as great pains to make her members good citizens of the United States of America as she does to make them fit subjects of the New Jerusalem. She must make her members feel that politics is just as much a department of kingdom service as Bible study or missions. I question whether there is any department of our life in this day of social rebuilding that offers as great an opportunity for kingdom service as political life. The teacher and the preacher may lift up the ideals after which we must strive; and they may spend their time in private and public agitation for

a better world; but the man who holds public office holds the keys that can open or close the doors upon the realization of our ideals. The man in public office has an opportunity for direct service such as few, if any, of the other departments of life offer. The church may spare no effort to create a righteous attitude toward so important a department of our life. Every public office, from the lowest in the city ward to the highest in the gift of the nation, exists for the sake of public service. The man who seeks public office should be made to feel that he must do so out of the Christian desire to serve his fellow men just as much as the man who seeks election to the pastorate of a Christian congregation. The one office is just as sacred as the other; and the church should make men feel that such is the case. This, however, means a reversal of her former position, for the church has always taught that the one kind of work is "secular" and the other "sacred." No wonder that the men who have taken the church seriously have made the sacred domain of politics secular.

On the other hand, there is urgent need for a keener public sentiment against the men who seek public office for the purpose of self-aggrandisement. Public sentiment should be inspired to brand, as an undesirable citizen, any man who betrays the sacred trust which his fellow citizens have committed to him by electing him to public office. All through the centuries the church made all classes of people fear and tremble lest they should suffer everlasting punishment if they were not baptized or did not belong to church. It would have been of far more social consequence if men had been made to fear everlasting punishment if, for selfish reasons, they betrayed such a sacred trust as is committed to a man when he is elected to public office by his confident fellow citizens.

The creation of a new type of conscience,—a political conscience that is as keen and as sensitive as the old-type

church conscience was, is the first step in the christianizing of the nation. Of all our institutions the church is the best prepared to render this service.

The second step in the Christianizing of the Nation.— An enlightened people must be given an opportunity for self-expression. There must be adequate political machinery by means of which the christianized social-will can realize itself. Jesus showed the wisdom of the social philosopher when he warned us against putting new wine into old wine-skins. Old and unyielding institutions are apt to be shattered by the ferment of new and expanding ideas. It is an extremely risky thing to create an intelligent social-will without at the same time making adequate provision for its self-expression. This is the predicament in which many communities find themselves today, especially in Europe, and in certain parts of Asia. The masses have become more enlightened, either through the progress of popular education, or through contact with the world, while the opportunity for self-expression or self-government, has been denied them. This is one cause for much of the social unrest throughout the world. An intelligent social-will will sooner or later demand a popular form of government. The christianizing of the state and the democratizing of its government cannot be kept apart. Democracy follows in the path of the religion of the kingdom of God as naturally as light follows in the path of the sun.

Democracy, it is true, is *a spirit* of government rather than *a form* of government. Democracy is a state whose fundamental purpose is to give all its citizens equal liberty and opportunity. It is a spirit in government that aims to give each individual citizen a maximum freedom of activity so long as the exercise of that freedom does not interfere with the freedom of others. It is possible that this ideal may be realized in a monarchy as well as in a state that delegates the governing power to

the people. If all absolute monarchs were wise and good men, who have the interests of their subjects at heart, an absolute monarchy might be preferable to a democracy. But there can be no guarantee that absolute monarchs will always be wise and good men. There is a tremendous social risk in delegating so much power into the hands of one man, or a few men. The curse of absolute monarchies is the possibility of the easy betrayal of the great social trust that is committed to mere chance hereditary rulers and their hireling associates.

Whatever may be said in favor of this or of that form of government, the steady trend of political evolution since the English revolution in 1688 and the French revolution in 1789, has been away from government by a small hereditary class, to some form of popular government. An enlightened people, such as the kingdom of God implies, will sooner or later, demand a full voice and a free hand in the making and the executing of the laws by which they and their interests are governed. This right should not, and indeed cannot, be withheld from them. The franchise, which is the most common medium of political expression, must sooner or later be granted to all citizens regardless of sex or color. Wherever the restricted ballot prevails, such as the denial of the right of the franchise to women, or the granting of a number of votes to certain classes of citizens as is still the custom in some European communities, the social-will is clogged. Such a condition will not endure long in a community of enlightened citizens such as the kingdom of God implies.

Something more, however, than the universal franchise is necessary in order to give the fullest possible expression to the enlightened and morally sensitized social-will which the christianizing of the nation implies. Under the democratic form of government which prevails at the present time in the great majority of communities of our Union, there is no way of initiating any specific legisla-

tion which the citizens of the community may feel to be necessary; nor is there any satisfactory way for the legislators to determine what their home constituency may desire of them in any important matters. At the present time we have no satisfactory social control over our legislators. We are still too much at the mercy of the men whom we elect to office. If they are good men, who have the wishes and the welfare of the community at heart, our interests will be safe in their hands; but if they are selfish men, who are in public office for what they can get out of it for themselves, it will be bad for the community that elected them. A man may have been elected to office by the vote of all the citizens, male and female, white and black, and yet grossly misrepresent them for the full term of his office. The present political machinery does not give the people sufficient power over exploiting politicians and over corrupt political parties.

The enlightened social-will demands, in addition to the universal franchise, something on the principle of *the initiative, the referendum,* and *the recall,* which have made their appearance in a few communities. The initiative would give the people the opportunity to originate, by vote, certain legislative measures which they may feel to be vitally necessary. The referendum would give the legislators and their home constituency a direct way of determining whether or not certain contemplated matters of legislation are desirable. And the recall would give the people the power, by vote of the majority, to recall from public office before the expiration of his term, any man who has betrayed the sacred trust which had been commited to him by the community.

To create a keen social-will and not make adequate provision for its full and free self-expression may result in the ferment of the new spirit doing violence to the existing order of things.

A Danger not to be Overlooked.—It is quite evident that

a form of self-government, such as the one indicated, would be a very troublesome, and indeed dangerous thing, in the hands of any but the most enlightened and moral citizenship. But the kingdom of God implies the training of a citizenship that is capable of the most perfected form of self-government. The kingdom of God forbids us to stop short of anything but the most perfect type of citizenship that can be developed on this earth. A tremendous task is imposed not only upon the church, but upon our system of public education, and upon every department of the nation's life. We are still very far from the goal of perfect citizenship which is set for us in the idea of the kingdom of God.

In "Education and General Welfare," F. K. Sechrist states that, in 1900, 8.4% of the total voting population of the United States was unable to read or write, while in a number of Southern communities as high as 20% of the voting population was made up of illiterates. The *Pennsylvania School Journal,* for April, 1921, states that one out of every four of the young men who were drafted for war-service failed in the simple literacy test. They were unable either to read a newspaper or to write a letter home. Surveys made recently in certain metropolitan communities show that 600 out of every 1000 children who enter the first grade drop out of school before the eighth grade is reached, while only 14 out of the 1000 get to college. Self-government, such as was indicated above, and such as the kingdom of God implies, is not possible in the hands of illiterates; nor can it become efficient in the hands of sixth graders. It may require radical reconstruction in our whole social order to give every citizen the education that is necessary to make self-government safe and efficient. But it is a duty which the kingdom of God imposes upon us, and we may not shirk it no matter how difficult it may be.

Not only shall every child be given the privilege of the public schools for a certain number of years, but the

education that we give the child should be adapted to the ends of efficient citizenship. Our system of education has not concerned itself sufficiently with the training of boys and girls for citizenship. So much reading, writing, and arithmetic; so much algebra and geometry; and the mastery of the physical sciences are very necessary. But there are other equally necessary things which have been neglected. The mastery of the physical sciences should be supplemented by the mastery of the social sciences. Men should not only be taught how to master nature, but also how to live together. We must bring our public schools to that point where they will prepare the boys and girls physically, mentally, and morally to take their place in a self-governing society.

The first steps then in the christianizing of the nation are the training of a citizenship that is mentally and morally capable of self-government, and the perfecting of the political machinery that will encourage and facilitate such self-government. The Christian church can become a potent factor in this social task. The church, through the teaching and preaching of the religion of the kingdom of God, can do much in the way of creating a wholesome public sentiment on social and political questions; and this is of fundamental importance. Other necessary things will follow as a consequence. Christian public sentiment will eventually crystallize into just laws. This is the normal way of progress. The social preaching of men like Amos, Micah, and Isaiah, may have seemed useless to the men who preferred to make progress by resort to physical force. But their preaching was not in vain. It was the fearless social message of these prophets and the public sentiment which their preaching helped to create that, in a later generation, crystallized into the remarkable set of humanitarian laws in Deuteronomy. And the preaching of the social Gospel will also help to develop the social-spirited type of Christian individual who will be interested in the

perfecting of the political machinery that will facilitate the executing of the laws that we have.

The Supreme Thing in the Christianizing of the Nation.—The christianizing of the nation implies something more than the creation of a Christian public conscience and a sense of civic responsibility in a certain number of individual citizens. The conduct of the nation, as a Super-Personal Entity, must become Christian. Apart from this no nation is Christian.

In the preceding section attention was called to the fact that a well organized community is something more than an aggregation of individuals living within certain mechanically-drawn boundary lines. In the work previously referred to, Professor Royce says: "A highly organized community is as truly a human being as you and I are individually human. Only a community is not what we commonly call a human being, because it has no one separately and well knit physical organism of its own; and because its mind, if you attribute to it any one mind, is therefore not manifested through the expressive movements of such a single separate human organism. Yet there are reasons for attributing to a community a mind of its own. The communities are vastly more complex, and, in many ways, are immeasurably more potent and enduring than are the individuals. Their mental life possesses, as Wundt has pointed out, a psychology of its own, which can be systematically studied. Their mental existence is no mere creation of abstract thinking or of metaphor, and is no more a topic for mental insight, or for phantastic speculation, than is the mental existence of an individual man." [1]

The United States of America, as a highly organized community, is something more than the sum of its 107,000,000 individual citizens living between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, and between the Gulf of

[1] The Problem of Christianity, I, pp. 164–167.

Mexico and the forty ninth degree of latitude. It is something more than the external union of its forty eight separate states. It is something more than the historical continuity of certain traditions. It is more than a mere abstraction of thought, a name for an aggregation of separate persons and things. The United States of America is a great politico-social personality. The United States is a super-person as real as any individual person. The tall, lanky figure, with the big, kind eyes, the stern brow, and clothed in the "stars and stripes," represents something as real and as personal as does the portrait of George Washington or Abraham Lincoln. Our "Uncle Sam" is a personality as real as any one of his 107,000,000 citizens.

Here then are new responsibilities for the church. Since a community, or nation, has a mind of its own that can be scientifically analyzed and psychologically studied, it must also be conceded that it has a will and a conscience of its own. We must therefore demand that such a super-person pursue a Christian course of life. We must insist that such a super-personal being act in conformity with the same standard of ethics that we prescribe for any individual person. Because the church has not been in the habit of thinking in terms of social psychology, she has failed to apply to super-personal beings such as corporations, stock companies, communities, and nations, the same standard of ethics that we have been applying to individuals. The result has been that while we have been living according to one standard of ethics as individuals, these super-personal beings have been living according to another standard, or frequently have disregarded all ethics, and have lived like "publicans and sinners."

For many centuries there has been a quite common agreement among all civilized people that certain things are wrong for an individual to do; but we have allowed these super-persons to do these things without protest.

For example, we condemn the individual for coveting his neighbor's fields, for lying and the breaking of faith, and for stealing. We consider it a most heinous crime for an individual to kill another under any conditions save in pure self-defense, or in the unquestioned defense of the life or the limbs of another. We condemn all forms of selfishness in the individual. We declare it wrong for any individual to live a self-centered life, regardless of the rights and interests of others. And should any individual disregard the ethical judgment of the community and arm himself with knives and guns in order to force his selfish will upon his neighbors, we would put him behind iron bars. But if these things are wrong for the individual, then they must also be declared wrong for super-individuals such as nations. The church should be just as clear and as persistent in her condemnation of the shortcomings of nations, including the nation of which she is an organic part, as she is in the condemnation of the sins of individuals.

On the other hand, we have recognized certain things as right for the individual to do. Certain rules have almost universally been recognized as binding for the individual, while we have not recognized them as binding for super-individuals. To the individual we say: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you"; "Ye who are strong should bear the burdens of the weak"; "Be ye merciful as your Father in heaven is merciful"; etc. But if it is right that individuals should do these things, then we must insist that nations do them too. There is no such thing as a double standard of ethics in the kingdom of God: one standard for men and another for women: one standard for individuals and another for super-individuals. There is only one ethical plumb-line, and all conduct, whether individual or corporate, must be squared by it. A nation is not Christian until it conducts itself in all its relationships as a Christian individual conducts himself.

How well the nations of the earth measure up to this kingdom-requirement is not a pleasant subject for reflection. There is no such thing anywhere as a Christian nation, no matter how many of its citizens may belong to church, or how many of them may be good Christians as individuals. There is not a nation anywhere whose life does not revolve around things rather than around human welfare. All the nations are still markedly self-centered. They are all prejudiced against each other, and mutually distrustful of each other; therefore they are armed to the teeth, ready to strike the moment that one crosses the path that leads to the self-interest of the other. Patriotism is still narrow, selfish, and essentially unchristian. Patriotism is not animated by the world-spirit, but is hedged in between such and such rivers and mountains, and such and such degrees of latitude and longitude. The more intensely we seem to love our own nation, the less inclined we are to love other nations. This unchristian nationalism has precipitated war after war, and has deluged the world with sufferings, and crimes, and horrors.

The great world-community of the nations is still in the uncivilized stage of anarchy. Each one of these great super-persons runs loose, while it is armed with murderous knives and guns; and every now and then there is a hold-up on the highways of the world and robbery and murder are committed by the wholesale. It is true that these super-beings have had some agreements and understandings between themselves. There has been such a thing as international diplomacy and arbitration. The world-community has had a court at the Hague, which is at least the semblance of what we have in every civilized community. But this inter-national court has had only advisory power, and good advice means nothing to an individual who is selfishly determined to have his own way, and who is at the same time prepared to enforce his will. There never has been any centralized power,

such as we have in every civilized community, to which these super-persons are amenable. After two thousand years of Christian history the great world-community of the nations, the community of the super-individuals, is still in the state of barbarism and anarchy. There is no such thing as international laws that are binding. Each super-individual is a law unto itself. It arms itself sufficiently either to murder its neighbors, or to defend itself against the murderous intentions of its unregenerated neighbors.

The Christianizing of the nation presupposes some such organization as we have found good and helpful in the local community. In the interest of peace and order we have taken knives and guns from all individual citizens. We have made it unlawful for any individual to arm himself against his neighbors, whether with the peaceful intention of a probably necessary self-defense, or with the selfish intention of criminal offense. In addition to disarming the individual, we have organized the community for the purpose of a peaceful and just settlement of all misunderstandings; and for the further purpose of giving to each individual citizen that freedom which his highest self-development demands. If any trouble arises between two individuals which they will not or cannot adjust between themselves, they can go to an alderman, or lawyer, who, as a disinterested third party, will give them wise counsel. In all minor matters a just alderman or lawyer will urge a peaceful compromise. But if the pugnacious individuals will not compromise, they have recourse to the higher courts. It is the duty of the court to view the case with the disinterested eye of justice. The court, finally, is backed up by the police force, which is the community's standing army, and which will enforce the decree of the court. No civilized community will allow its citizens to make war on each other.

This simple organization has worked remarkably well

considering the fact that the best of communities are made up of only partially regenerated citizens. It would be difficult to find any one who would say that it was unwise to disarm the individual citizens and to arm the community instead. The most ardent champion of national preparedness, even if he were a stockholder in a munition factory, would hardly venture the opinion that it is endangering the life or the freedom of the individual not to allow him to arm himself against his neighbors. The arming of the community has made the disarmed citizen much safer than his pockets' full of knives and guns could have made him in a community of armed anarchists. This simple organization of the community in the interest of peace and order has meant not only peace between individuals, but also the general welfare of the individuals. Instead of depriving individuals of their liberty, it is the surest way of guaranteeing their liberty. Relieved by the community of the burden of a pocket full of knives and guns, and also relieved of the constant paralyzing fear of attack by his armed and covetous neighbors, the individual has been left free to develop his manhood and his personality. It has proved itself, by a long and almost universal trial, to be a piece of political organization that has a very wholesome effect upon the behavior of individuals. Instead of having to wait until all individuals would be saints before it would be wise and safe to adopt universal disarmanent in the local community and the arming of the community instead, we have found that this method has made some very unsaintly individuals at least peaceful if not saintly.

This same method has been adopted by the nations in the governing of their provinces or states. Instead of each individual province or state arming itself, the nation, or the community of states and provinces, arms itself and offers its protection to the individual units. This leaves the individual state or province free to develop its resources. It is the only way that the nations have been

able to save themselves from perpetual internal warfare and possible disruption.

But this is as far as we have come in the political organization of the world for peace, and for the protection and encouragement of the weaker nations of the earth. The German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, and the French free-thinker, Rousseau, were among the first men of the modern world to give serious thought to the political organization of the world for peace and for the sake of the highest self-realization of the nations. In the class room of the university we have studied the works of these men as examples of philosophic thinking, but outside of the class room we have treated their lofty ideals as philosophic nonsense.

During the fright which German militarism gave the world from 1914 to 1918, politicians and financiers for the first time in the history of the world talked seriously about the pressing need of a stable league of nations as the only safe-guard against militaristic nationalism. But no sooner had the temporary fright subsided than the characteristic European and American nationalism again began to manifest itself. Practically all of President Wilson's fine idealism, which he took with him to Versailles, quickly vanished before the conventional European diplomacy. And it has been curbed still further by selfish, partisan politics here at home. The shameful gamble for the spoils in blood-drenched Europe, and the petty dickering of partisan politics here in America, show how far the "Christian nations" still are from being Christian. But we are thankful for the little that we have gained in the way of a closer coöperation between the nations. Present failures may become stepping stones to future success. President Wilson has gone down to defeat. His career is as pathetic as that of King Saul of Israel. But the ideals which he championed have not been defeated. Crushed to earth they will rise again and will bear fruit long after President Wilson will be forgotten.

The ultimate goal of political evolution is a League, or Federation of the Nations, with a Permanent International Court, which has the three-fold power to make, to interpret, and to execute laws that are binding upon the individual units that compose it. But that presupposes, as the only ground of its practicability, the disarming of the individual units that compose the Federation, and the arming of the Federation instead. Nothing short of such a stable organization of the world, patterned after that which has worked so long and so well in the local community, will secure the ultimate "peace on earth, good will to men," which the kingdom of God so clearly implies. Diplomacy, arbitration, and limitation of armaments, can, at best, serve only as means or stepping stones toward this ultimate goal.

Such a brotherhood of the nations,—or of the superpersons,—is implied in the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God; and in the march toward this goal the church should lead the way. It may be a far-distant day that will see its realization. It will require a great deal of patient teaching and preaching. There may be other devastating wars before the world's burdens and sorrows will demand of our law-makers and politicians the common-sense organization that will prevent war, and that will encourage peaceful coöperation between the nations. Until then each generation of Christians must contribute its share to the forward movement to take the nations for God. The church, as an instrument of the kingdom of God, dare not rest satisfied with the number of individual converts that she may make, the number of churches she may erect, and the amount of money she may gather for benevolence. Her task is not finished until she has done her share in making the nations of the earth as saintly and as brotherly as the best Christian individual is. It is a great social challenge that comes to the church—one that should arouse all her latent powers.

IV

CHRISTIANIZING INDUSTRY [1]

The winning of industry for the kingdom of God must be the next adventure of the church.

Industry has not met the Requirements of the Kingdom. —Industry is still essentially a pagan institution. The struggle for our daily bread, which occupies the major portion of the average man's time, is still under the control of the animal impulses, The spirit of industry contradicts the fundamental purposes of the kingdom of God. In the kingdom of God everything revolves around men and their welfare; while in industry everything revolves around things. In the kingdom of God the object is service in the interest of life for everybody; while in industry the object is profit for a particular class of people. The kingdom of God bids us use things in the interest of life; while industry sacrifices life in the interest of things. The kingdom of God encourages mutual coöperation in the interest of human welfare and happiness; while industry practices destructive competition for the sake of profit for the strongest.

In both form and spirit modern industry is autocratic. In the world of politics we have been slowly moving away from autocracy toward democracy. Absolute monarchies. where all power is vested in one man or in a few men, have had their day. The undeniable trend in the political world has been toward popular government of some kind. In industry, however, we have been moving in the opposite direction. In the world of business we have been moving toward autocracy, and still more autocracy. From the simple conditions of a few generations ago when men worked with their own simple tools, in

[1] For official corroboration of much of the statistical material in this section see: The Final Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations, Senate Document 415, 64th Congress.

their own little shops located on their own ground, and carried their own goods to market, we have passed into a state where the employees, until the quite recent advent of the labor union, had as little to say as the political subjects of the late Czar of Russia.

The first step toward industrial autocracy was simple partnership in business,—the alliance of two men or of half a dozen men and their capital to conduct a certain line of business as, for example, a grocery store or a carpet shop. Through the united efforts of a few men and their capital the business could be conducted more efficiently and competition be made more effective than through the efforts of one man. The second step was what is known as centralization in business. This is a state where a few men, through a formidable combination of capital and influence, form a monopoly of a certain line of industry such as coal, oil, iron, or steel. Competition, as far as possible, is driven from this particular field, thus leaving the public to the mercy of the monopoly. The third and most dangerous step in the move toward industrial autocracy was what is known as consolidation. This is a state where a few men, through immense capitalization and political power, control many different lines of industry. The United States Steel Trust, for example, capitalized so as to make all rival competition practically hopeless, owns and controls more than a score of different industries such as steel, iron, copper, zinc, lime, etc., as well as transportation lines which carry the raw material to the mills and the finished product to the market. The Meat Packers, according to the report of Government Inspector Frances J. Heney, extended their control not only over the beef and pork market of the whole country, but also over the hides and leather market, the butter market, the egg market, the cheese market, the poultry market, the canned fish industry, the canned vegetable business, the grain market including the rice market. And at the time when the Federal Government felt

compelled to call a halt to their monopolizing of the food supply of the whole country, they were in the act of gaining control of the great chain stores system. It is difficult to conceive of a more dangerous kind of autocracy than such a controlling of a country's food supply by a quite small class of citizens for their own personal profit. About 80% of the country's business is done through these three kinds of capitalistic management.

In a surprisingly short time after the advent of the modern industrial era, a quite small percentage of the population, in every country in the world, had gained control of practically all the raw material which the good God has so bountifully provided for the welfare and happiness of all His children. These same men, animated primarily by the desire for profit and personal power, gained control of practically all the tools and the factories, the transportation lines and the markets. In every civilized country in the wide world, a quite small percentage of the people own and control practically everything that enters into the manufacture and exchange of goods. They own and control the material means of the life and the happiness of the citizens of the nation.[1]

On the other hand, the majority of citizens have become dispossessed of everything that enters into the manufacture of goods but their physical or mental ability to work. The worker of a few generations ago, who owned his own shop and tools, no matter how few and simple they were, had something substantial standing between him and want. But all that stands between the modern wage-earner and want are his health and his job. If his health holds out and his job lasts, he and his family may fare all right. But both his health and his job are uncertain commodities. His health may fail him at any time; and his job depends upon whether or not it

[1] In "Dynastic America" pp. 11, 12, Henry H. Klein, names one hundred families who own and control most of the wealth, the railways and the fourteen great basic industries of America.

will pay his employer to give it or to withhold it. Dispossessed of everything but their ability to work, the modern wage-earners, until the recent advent of the labor union, were wholly at the mercy of their employers. The workers had no voice, no hand, *no anything,* in the management of the business. They were in a real sense the property of the men who owned the mills and the machines. Labor was considered a commodity, which the employer bought in the open market for the least cent, just as he did raw silk or pig iron. Wages and hours of work were not considered as matters of life, but as factors in the production and exchange of goods. The longer the hours and the lower the wages the more profit the employers expected to make on their goods. The number of hours, the amount of pay, and the general working conditions in and about the shops, were all determined by those who owned the business. It did not seem to occur to the employer, or for that matter to the public, that labor is just as vital in the manufacture and exchange of goods as are capital and management. Under the false and inhuman assumption that labor is only a commodity like horse-power, the working men had to accept the terms as they were laid down for them by their masters, or go elsewhere, where, of course, they knew they would find the same conditions. The few rights which the workers had learned to appreciate in matters of government were denied them in matters of industry. So long as the workers bargained singly, whether for an increase in wages or for a reduction in the hours of work, there was no hope for them. Business was conducted for profit, not as a matter of public service; and long hours and low wages were supposed to be most conducive to profit. That, in most instances, settled the matter.

This autocratic and unbrotherly spirit in industry was the real cause of labor unions. The combination of capital, against whose strength and tactics the individual bargaining of the workers availed nothing at all, inspired

the collective bargaining of labor. As the only conceivable means of defense or offense against the impregnable entrenchments of capital, the workers began to consolidate their strength in labor unions. The giant labor, chained for five thousand years, has broken his shackles and has begun to realize his power. If the different departments of labor would consolidate their strength, as capital has done, their power would be irresistible. Modern labor knows this; and there are no uncertain signs in many sections of the labor world that it may act in accordance with the power that it knows it possesses. It is not impossible that the industrial pendulum may swing to the opposite extreme and that, for a while at least, we may suffer from a new type of industrial autocracy—that of the labor union.

But in our attitude toward organized labor, especially because of the defiant and dictatorial spirit which it has manifested of late, let us remember that the collective action of labor was preceded, by many years, by the collective action of capital. Whatever inconvenience we may suffer, and whatever abuse of power on the part of labor that we may witness before industrial peace will come, must ultimately be charged against capital; for there would have been no labor unions and no labor troubles, if capital, during the years of its uncurbed power, had treated labor with brotherly consideration. For many centuries the toilers in forest and field and shop were as meek and as submissive as their companions of the yoke, the patient oxen. And labor thus far, with few exceptions, has been bargaining only for a decent living, while capital, in cases too numerous to count, has been bargaining for wanton extravagance and unpardonable luxuries. There is a difference, at a time like this, between labor bargaining for seventy-five cents or even a dollar an hour, and capital bargaining for 100% profit.

If capitalistic industry had been organized and conducted for the purpose of service to the public for a just

and reasonable profit to the promoters, we would have no fault to find with it. If this had been the case we would tolerate its monarchic form and its autocratic spirit in the midst of our otherwise democratic state. But the unjust distribution of the conjointly produced wealth in every community of the civilized world is irrefutable proof that the present industrial and financial system has been planned and executed for the enrichment of one class of people at the expense of others. No unbiased student of history, who is at all familiar with the facts, would say that the conjointly produced wealth of the average community has been distributed on the basis of the public service that has been rendered, or that an attempt has been made to distribute it on such a basis. While there are very many business men of the finest and noblest type,—men who make their business a means of public service with as much sincerity and conscientiousness as any preacher of the Gospel,—nevertheless capitalistic business as a whole stands condemned before the bar of the world as a pagan institution that places its own profit above every other consideration. And while we have all been the victims of its greed, no other class of citizens has suffered so much injustice and indignity at its hands as the class of manual laborers. From the days of chattel slavery and feudal serfdom on down to the present day of capitalistic autocracy, they have been systematically denied not only their rightful share of the wealth which they have helped to create, but frequently also the divine right to their limbs, their life, and the pursuit of happiness.

Industry Has Failed to Render Justice in the Distribution of the Wealth of the Community.—"In 1900," according to figures published by Professor Henry C. Vedder, of Crozer Theological Seminary,[1] "nine-tenths of one per cent. of the population of the United States owned 70.5% of the wealth; 29% owned 25.2% of the wealth;

[1] See: Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus, p. 240.

while 70.1% of the people owned 4.2% of the wealth." The nine-tenth of one per cent. of the people who owned 70.5% of the wealth, represented the lords of industry and finance. The 70.1% of the people who owned 4.2% of the wealth, represented the great host of wage-earners, many small business men, and the small salaried people. The 29% of the people who owned 25.2% of the wealth, represented the better salaried people and the ordinary business men. Stated more concretely, Professor Vedder's figures show that, in 1900, when capitalism was at the height of its autocratic power, 900,000 people at one end of society owned more of the country's wealth than 70,000,000 at the other end. This tells a sad tale of criminal injustice and brutal wrong somewhere along the line. As Professor Rauschenbusch has said: "Some one has stolen and somebody has been robbed."

Since 1900, wealth has increased in the United States by leaps and bounds. And while concentration is not as acute as it was twenty years ago, the general public has by no means profited in proportion to the general increase in wealth. Professor W. I. King, of the University of Wisconsin, says that 2% of the people still own considerably more property than all the other citizens together. The slight relief from the acute concentration is due to the wider distribution of income through the increase in wages since 1900. But the increase of wages has not been sufficient to relieve the situation very much. King says the average adult wage for 1912 was only $549. Professor Harry F. Ward, of the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, says that 10,000,000 adult wage-earners in the United States earned only $500 in 1914, and that nine-tenths of all the female wage-earners east of the Rocky Mountains and north of the Mason and Dixon line earned less than $500 in that same year. The report of the United States Commission on Industrial Relations for 1915 states that in only a few highly paid occupations did the income of working men range from

$1500 to $2000 a year. From two-thirds to three-fourths of the adult males in industrial occupations earned only $15 a week, and females only $8, in 1915. At that rate the concentration will not be relieved very rapidly.

Since 1915 wages have been considerably increased, but so also have living expenses. Because of the decrease in the purchasing value of the dollar the average man has been just as poor since 1915 as he was before. Wherever a reliable study was made over an extended area of the ratio between the increase in wages and the increase in living expenses from 1914 to 1918 it was found that living expenses had increased more than wages. In the state of Massachusetts, for example, living expenses increased 87% from 1914 to 1918, while wages, including all classes of wage-earners, increased only 53%. In most comunities the gap between the increase in wages and living expenses was not as great as that. But there are few communities where the increase in wages of the average man equalled or exceeded the increase in living expenses. In 37 different occupations investigated by Messrs. Hannah and Lauck the average advance in wages was 42%, while the cost of living had increased about 70%. Since 1918 prices have been dropping, but the average income of working people, through the reduction of wages and part-time work, has dropped more than prices.

There are few important things at the present time that are more commonly misunderstood than the income of the average man. Because in certain trades wages are good, we are too apt to infer that all wage-earners are well paid. But such is not the case. The wages of the great host of unorganized laborers, teamsters, clerks, etc., have not been increased in the same proportion as the wages of such highly organized workers as carpenters, bricklayers, machinists, plumbers, and the railroad trainmen. And, furthermore, it is unsafe to infer that the carpenter's or the bricklayer's anual income is $2400 because he gets a dollar an hour. There is a difference between hypotheti-

cal wages and actual wages. The Manly Commission has reported that the average wage-earner loses from one-sixth to one-fifth of the working days of the year. A thunder storm may deduct 50¢, and the grippe, or a delay in the shipment of some building material, may deduct $50 from his pay. The working man's family does not live on what the head of the family would earn if he worked every working hour of every working day of the year, but on so much an hour times the actual number of hours that he works.

During the month of July, 1921, according to the statistics of the United States Bureau of Labor, the average earnings of steel and iron workers were $76.99; of automobile workers $132.48; of car builders and repairers $118.66; of cotton workers $67.56; of woolen workers $90.08; of silk workers $85.18; of men's clothing workers $125.40; of shoe workers $89.72. These are average trades, and the month of July was an average month. These figures are therefore fairly representative of industrial wages for the first six months of 1921. In the industries of Pennsylvania the average wage for the year 1920 was $1223.33. In the unorganized trades wages, during this same time, were considerably lower.

A very serious matter for the average man is the periodic recurrence of industrial depressions and panics which consume what little capital he has been able to accumulate during more prosperous times. A recent study of the history of panics by two eminent political economists shows that our country has been visited by a serious industrial depression or an actual panic every six and a half years for the last one hundred and seven years. There were financial depressions or panics in 1814, '18, '26, '29, '37, '48, '57, '64, '73, '84, '93, '97; in 1903, '07, '13, and '21. During these depressions many small business men are forced into bankruptcy, while the small accumulations of the average working man become exhausted. A few more months of unemployment will exhaust the small

accumulations which the most provident working men saved on their wages during the last three or four prosperous years. With grim regularity the few fat years have been consumed by a few lean years ever since the capitalistic system shed its milk teeth in 1812.

But many people believe that the manual laborer is getting all that his labor actually adds to the value of the raw material. Any one who knows the present day working people knows that many a wage-earner not only gets all that he earns, but a great deal more than he earns. There are many working men who are clamoring loudly for $10 a day pay for 50¢ worth of labor. Sabotage is a very common crime of labor, especially in the highly organized trades where the dishonest workman gets equal protection with the honest one. There are too many working men who take no interest at all in their work. The honest employer who must deal with this kind of employee has my sincere sympathy. It is a pity that dishonest and unscrupulous labor spoils the good reputation of the great host of honorable American and English working men. But we must not allow this to prejudice us against the wage-earners as a class. That the wage earning class is getting all that it earns, or that the average laborer gets all that his labor adds to the value of the raw material, is not true. Professor Ward, who made a careful study of this matter, over an extended area, says that "the average wage in 1914, in the manufacturing plants of the country was $670 per capita. The value of the finished product per capita was $3000. After allowing a liberal estimate for the value of the raw material and all over-head expenses, it appeared that the workers, including the managers, received only about 40% of what had been added to the value of the raw material. The rest was profit claimed as the earnings of capital." [1] Can any reasonable man feel that 40% as wages, including the big salaries of the superintendents and managers, and the balance as the re-

[1] The Gospel for a Working World, p. 91.

ward of capital, is a just distribution of the joint earnings of industry? Can we hope for an abatement of the unrest that is shaking the industrial world to its foundations, so long as no constructive efforts are made to bring about a more equitable distribution of the good things to the creation of which we all contribute our share?

It is evident from the latest available figures that no serious efforts have been made since 1914 to bring about a more equitable distribution of the joint earnings of industry. According to the statistics compiled by the department of Internal Affairs for the year 1920, the average wage earner in Pennsylvania earned five times as much as his wages amounted to. According to these figures the average annual wage in Pennsylvania for 1920 was $1223.33, while the production of each averaged about $5810. Surely the principles of the kingdom of God are still being violated in the industries of Pennsylvania.

The president of one of our great steel corporations, in an address before the Allentown Chamber of Commerce, a few years ago, compared big business to a three-legged stool, capital, labor, and transportation, forming the respective legs without which the stool cannot stand. The conclusion was that each of these three contributing parties should receive an equal share of the joint earnings of the business. It would be a fair conclusion to draw if it were true, as the analogy of the three-legged stool assumed, that the few capitalists who own the mills actually added as much to the value of the finished product as the 10,000 working people. But the premise is not true, and the world can no longer be deceived by this kind of worn out fallacy. The argument that capital should receive as much as labor in a great concern like a steel mill is fundamentally wrong. In the kingdom of God we dare not tolerate an injustice as gross as that which attempts to give to a few capitalists as much as a whole community gets. Any scheme of distribution that fails to give to the various contributing parties the equivalent of what they

actually contribute is unjust, and cannot be approved of in the kingdom of God. The present system of industry has made no effort at a just distribution of the wealth that has been created. Business, as a rule, keeps as much as it can for itself, and gives as little as it must for its help and for the patronage of the public.

The income tax receipts are a new source of proof of the fact that the present industrial and financial system is not inspired by the principle of justice in the distribution of the wealth of the community. In 1916, for example, 2,900 individuals reported incomes ranging from $100,000 to $150,000; 1,284 individuals from $150,000 to $200,000; 726 individuals from $200,000 to $250,000; 427 individuals from $250,000 to $300,000; 469 individuals from $300,000 to $400,000; 425 individuals from $400,000 to $500,000; 376 individuals from $500,000 to $1,000,000; 97 individuals from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000; 42 individuals from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000; 34 individuals from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000; 14 individuals from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000; 9 individuals from $4,000,000 to $5,000,000; and 10 individuals over $5,000,000 each. The incomes of the twenty-six highest individuals aggregated $170,000,000.

The total income of all the citizens of the United States for 1917 was about $38,250,000,000. There were 437,000 individuals in 1916, whose incomes for that year aggregated $6,300,000,000. Allowing for 70,000 single men and women among these 437,000 individuals, and reckoning a wife and three children for the rest, it would appear that about 2,000,000 individuals had one-fifth as much actual income as the other 100,000,000 citizens. A thing that is worthy of special notice is that there were very few from the great host of 25,000,000 manual laborers who reported incomes of $3000 on their wages alone. Another thing that deserves serious consideration is that 8,000 more millionaires were reported in 1916 than

in 1915. Surely these men of enormous incomes are not keeping for themselves only what they are worth to society, and a great many others are not getting all that they are worth. Somebody is still stealing, and somebody is still being robbed. Here is the chief cause of the widespread social unrest of our day. And the unrest will not abate until the cause for it will be removed.

Industry Has Been Subordinating the Life of the Workers to Its Own Profit.—In addition to the unjust distribution of the conjointly produced wealth of the community, the manual laborers, as a class, have been deprived of the full opportunity to live which belongs to man by divine right. For several thousand years, from the days of Greece and Rome, and all through the period of feudal serfdom, down to modern Russia, they were frequently denied the protection of the law, the privilege of education, and other inalienable rights of human beings. Ethics, religion, and public sentiment acquiesced in the opinion that the masses were born to toil that the classes might live without toil. It is only of quite recent date that there has been anything like just and humane labor legislation in any country in the world. And so far as I have been able to discover, the party that has had the control of industry, from the days of the feudal landlord to the days of the capitalistic autocrat, opposed those legislative measures that sought to place the life and the welfare of the workers above the profit of the employers. It was as late as 1842 that the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury succeeded in having a law placed on the statute books forbidding the employment of women, and of children under thirteen years of age, in the coal mines of England. And it was not until 1847 that he succeeded in having his famous Factory Act passed prohibiting children under twelve years of age from working over ten hours in England's unsanitary factories. It required fourteen years of incessant labor for Shaftesbury to accomplish

this. He was opposed by every vested interest in England, including the vested church. Shaftesbury's experience in England was not at all exceptional. Humane labor legislation has had to fight its way against the opposition of the moneyed powers in every age and in every country.

Even to-day the life of the manual laborer, in the best countries in the world, is unnecessarily jeopardized, and the conditions of labor are unnecessarily hard. Industrial accidents and ocupational diseases form one of the darkest chapters in human history. The death list of American industry, for the last twenty-five years, has averaged more than 25,000 a year. The number of accidents have averaged from 500,000 to more than 1,000,000 a year. During the last twenty-five years industry sacrificed more of our citizens than were sacrificed in any war in which our country was ever engaged. For the five year period, ending December 31, 1917, the casualty list of our American railroads alone was 980,565. Of this number 48,801 were deaths, and 931,764 were injuries. Each line of industry adds its grim toll to the list. Every ton of coal that is mined, and every great steel frame that is raised to the sky, has the blood of some workman upon it. The sufferings and deaths due to occupational disease form a longer and even darker chapter in the tragedy of human life than industrial accidents. In a number of our industries the foreign workmen are used up in six years, while in some industries they last on an average only four years. And yet they are human beings. In our prayer meetings we call them brothers, and in our mills we grind them up as fodder.

We used to be told that since men must work accidents must happen, and we believed it; but we have come to know that this is only partly true. Expert investigators, in this country and in Europe, tell us that fully half of all the deaths and serious accidents could be prevented, and that occupational disease could be reduced to a mini-

mum, if we would cease to place somebody's profit above somebody else's life. Wherever adequate precautionary measures have been adopted the number of accidents, and the amount of occupational disease, have been greatly reduced. The number of industrial accidents, and the prevalence of occupational disease, in a number of European countries where precautionary measures have been adopted and carried out, are far below the average here in the United States. Here in the United States, for example, one man out of every ten who have worked in the lead industry for ten years or longer suffers from lead-poisoning, while in England only one out of every eighty-nine is afflicted with this dreadful disease. In Germany the number of those affected is still smaller. The difference is due to England's and Germany's greater precaution in this dangerous business. How many American working men have sacrificed their lives, and how much suffering it has brought to their families, to put the fine polish on our automobiles only God in heaven knows! Some European countries prefer a dull finish on their automobiles to the prevalence of lead poisoning among their working people. Until recently the phosphorous poisoning in our match factories was as common and as deadly as the lead poisoning in our dye works and in our automobile plants. American industry is still sacrificing the life and the health of the workers in the interest of profit, a practice against which the kingdom of God bids us to speak plainly and fearlessly.

And not only is industry sacrificing life and health unnecessarily, but it is also denying a great host of men and women the leisure and the freedom from incessant toil and anxiety which real living demands. Long days and endless weeks in noisy mills and dusty factories are still quenching the divine fire in multitudes of men and women. The men who are compelled to work in some dingy factory for ten or twelve hours a day, for six or seven days of the week, and for just enough remun-

eration to secure a minimum of cheap food, cheap clothing, and cheap shelter for themselves and families, are denied the chance to live and to grow,–a right which the kingdom of God implies for everybody.

In 1910 there were still five great industries that were regularly working from 57% to 95% of their employees 72 hours a week. In that same year there were thirteen industries that regularly worked from 23% to 96% of their men 60 or more hours a week. The report of the Inter-Church Commission on the steel strike states that approximately one-half of the employees in the iron and steel manufacturing plants of the country are subjected to the schedule known as the twelve hour shift, which means an eleven to fourteen hour day. In the Youngstown steel and tube plants, where the investigation was less handicapped than it was in the Pittsburgh district, it was found that 10% of the employees were on the 8 hour schedule, 35% on the 10 hour, and 55% on the 12 hour schedule. It was also discovered that there has been a tendency, especially in the Gary plants, to increase rather than to decrease the long shifts. How many clerks in grocery stores and in drug stores, how many teamsters and how many kitchen and restaurant helps, are regularly working from 60 to 75 hours a week no one knows. In 1917, there were at least 1,500,000 men and women who were regularly working seven days or nights a week. All such are missing the privileges and blessings of real living.

The length of the working day or of the working week is only secondarily a matter of production. It is primarily a matter of life. The working day and week must not be made as long as the biggest profit seems to demand, but as short as is commensurate with adequate production. We have learned that it is not necessary to tie men and women and children to the wheels of industry for ten or twelve hours a day, and often for seven days a week, in order that the race may live. With the present scientific control of nature, an 8 hour day in the majority of in-

dustries, and a 6 hour day in such industries as the mining of coal, would be sufficient to produce enough for the race to live at its best. The shorter day would be one way of preventing the periodic over-production in certain lines of industry, which is one of the chief causes of unemployment. It would also greatly reduce the number of industrial accidents. Most accidents occur after the point of fatigue has been reached, which naturally occurs more regularly in the 10 or 12 hour day than it does in the 8 hour day. And it would give the working class a chance to live and to grow, a right that has too frequently been denied them.

It is true that the leisure derived by the sudden and universal adoption of the shorter working day and week might, if we would do nothing to prevent it, create as many social problems as it would remedy. It was pointed out in another connection that more people go wrong during the hours of leisure than at any other time. Dr. Martin G. Brumbaugh, ex-governor of Pennsylvania, prophesied recently that within twenty-five years we would have to be more concerned about legislation to regulate our leisure than about legislation to regulate our work. That prophecy may come true if we will do as little during the next twenty-five years as we did heretofore to safeguard our leisure. The kingdom of God imposes solemn duties upon us in this matter. Leisure is not the cause of wrong doing, but only the occasion for it. The kingdom of God urges us to remove, as far as possible, the occasions for wrong-doing during the hours of leisure, and also the duty of training citizens who are wise enough and moral enough to use their leisure as decent men ought to use it. I have no special fears that the working class would not use the leisure derived from the 8 hour day, and the 5½ day week, to as good advantage as any other class has used its leisure. The first use that the Printers' Union made of the 8 hour day was the establishing of a correspondence school in the artistic aspects of their craft. The moral

and social program which the New British Labor Party has in mind for the leisure hours of British working men is as Christian as any program that the churches of Great Britain have put before their people in many a year.

A particularly bad feature of the present system of industry is that the stockholders or promoters, in too many cases, are far removed in distance from the scenes of labor, and often still farther removed in experience and sympathy with the conditions of labor. They may know nothing of the wages that are paid, or of the hours of work, or of the conditions in the mills and in the community about the mills. The business, in too many cases, is managed by hired experts who are well paid for their ability to produce profit, and whose desire to please their employers and to hold their fat jobs, frequently makes them hard task masters. All that the stockholders know of the business,in too many instances, is the amount of profit on their investment. The bigger the profits the more pleased are the stockholders. But bigger profits, and more luxuries and extravagance for them and their families, too often mean correspondingly more sweat and blood for the workers and their families. About 80% of all the funds invested in our American industries come from absentee stockholders, who have no vital interest in the workers or in the community about the works—no vital interest in anything but the interest on their investment.

The proposition of Mr. H. G. Wells, the noted English war-correspondent and historian, might be a good one if it could be carried out. He suggests the adoption of the same method of conscription in industry that some countries employ in military affairs. He advocates the conscripting of every able-bodied youth, regardless of his social pedigree, for a stated period of service in some industry. That would give everybody a taste of real work. It would create sympathy for the working man, who is a human being like ourselves. If the soft-handed rich and their hireling supporters, who

have never shed an honest drop of sweat in their life, would be obliged to dig coal under the ground, or stand beside the molten metal in a blast furnace, for eight hours a day and for six days a week, for seventy cents an hour, every one of them would become an ardent unionist within six months, and they would be among the first to vote for a strike for a six hour day, a five and a half day week, and $1 an hour pay. And many of the fond papas and mammas, who are now indifferent to the bad working conditions in and about many of our mills and factories, would become very much concerned if they knew that their own dear boy and girl would have to spend three or four years in these same mills. Hours of work, wages, and the general conditions of labor, are human problems. They must be considered as factors in the culture of life, and not merely as factors in the production and exchange of goods.

It was against the economic and social injustice of their day that the prophets of the seventh and the eighth centuries B. C. hurled their thunderbolts. The most censurable thing in the history of the Christian church is that her mouth became muzzled on these identical wrongs in her day. The Christian church has been belittling her real mission by condemning minor offenses, and attending to petty duties, while she has been blind to such monstrous evils as the grinding up of the poor and the helpless in the interest of the swollen fortunes and the shameful extravagance of the rich. It surely is straining at gnats and swallowing the camel to whine over the evils of the modern block dance and Sunday band concerts, while we take it as a mere matter of course that 2% of the people own and control 65% of all the wealth of the country; or that one-fourth of all the families in the country are compelled to exist on less than the minimum requirement for efficient and happy living, while one-twentieth of the families are reveling in extravagance and excess. Until we have removed this great beam from

the eye of our civilization it is almost an indication of imbecility to be picking at the splinters.

Industry has been Subordinating the Welfare of the Community to its Own Profit.—The present system of industry, whose God is Mammon, has brought about conditions not only among the industrial laborers, but in the community at large, to which the church dare not be indifferent. The business of the church is to build up the life of the people, and she may not be indifferent to anything that breaks down or destroys life. That the commercial spirit which animates the present system has been destroying human life in the interest of profit is clear. The records of the examining boards during the world war assured the nations that Mammon worshipping industry has been using up the people. Amazing numbers of men in every country of the belligerents failed to meet the physical and mental requirements of the army and navy. There were, of course, many contributing causes for this failure. But whatever other contributing causes there were, the number of the ineligibles invariably rose or fell with hard or good conditions of labor. It was this discovery of industry's direct effect on the man-power of the nation that suddenly interested certain governments in such hitherto uninteresting matters as living wages, hours of work, the length of the working week, and the matter of air and sunlight in mills and factories. And we also know, with certainty, that the number of physically defective and mentally backward children invariably increases or decreases with bad or good conditions of labor. There is sufficient proof that the capitalistic system, which has been lauded as an indispensable and gracious factor in the up-building of the nation, is really a most insidious foe, because it has been consuming the very life-blood of the nation in the interest of its own profits.

Social psychology has proved that, as a rule, the moral

as well as the mental health of the individual and of society itself depends upon the height of the physical mercury in the human barometer. There is no longer any doubt about this. Our system of industry, which places profit above life, has created physical, moral, and social conditions in the average industrial community which make it exceedingly difficult, if not altogether impossible, for many people to be Christian. It is hard for a man to live an efficient Christian life while compelled to bring up a family on $3 a day, when two rooms on the third floor of a single dwelling house rent for $35 a month, and when a pair of overalls costs $2. Moral and æsthetic ideals do not appeal to men when their stomachs are empty and their toes are bare. John Wesley was right when he said: "You cannot convert a man as long as his feet are cold." And it is just as difficult a matter, on the other hand, for a man to retain a soul that is sensitive to the higher and finer ideals of life when every sense is clogged with the luxuries and superfluities of life. It is hard for a man to be brotherly and merciful to his neighbors when his whole business life is consumed in efforts to beat his competitors in the game, and to control prices and domineer markets. The man who is moved by the passion to control things, will naturally assume the same domineering attitude toward his fellow men. It could hardly be otherwise. And it is still harder for his children, who are reared in luxury and extravagance, and whose only occupation is to fill the hours of the days and nights with sport and frivolity, to be influenced by the simple, unselfish, sympathetic spirit of the kingdom of God. Our Christian communities are divided into classes of people who cannot enter into each others' lives,—who cannot understand each other,—who cannot sympathize with each other, for they live in different worlds,—worlds that have nothing in common. Great multitudes of people, poor people and rich people, ignorant people and learned people, men, women, and

children, have become the victims of an unchristian industrial system which, like a huge octopus, has put its horrid tentacles around them and has been sucking the warm life-blood from their bodies and quenching the divine fire in their souls.

It is in the extremes of society, which are to no small extent the product of the spirit and methods of our profit-controlled system of industry, that many of the worst sins that we have to contend with are bred. Among the enervated poor at the one end of society, and among the profligate rich at the other end, we find the worst forms of licentiousness—drunkenness, sexual excess, and unmitigated animalism. It is nerves that are drained by overwork and anxiety, or nerves that are surfeited with idleness and dissipation, that react most readily to temptation. Our system of industry, whose unpardonable sin is that it places profit above life, has helped to create the lairs that breed many of our contagious and infectious diseases. Tuberculosis, which destroys thousands of our people each year, is essentially an occupational disease. It has its perpetual quarters among the under-nourished, hard-worked, and poorly housed mill workers, from whence it stalks everywhere and consumes and kills. The percentage of tubercular victims is anywhere from 10% to 38% higher in the densely populated mill districts of our industrial centers than it is in the better residential sections.

It is difficult in all cases, and in many cases impossible, to make Christians of the people who live in the polar extremes of society. The agitation for a more equitable distribution of the community's wealth is not prompted by covetousness, but by the passion for social salvation. To be good and useful citizens many of our people need more of the good things of this life than they now have, and others less. There is an economic reason for the physical, mental, and moral superiority of that "once splendid middle class." To help increase this class which

has neither too little nor too much, instead of standing idly by while our system of industry is wiping it out, is one of the social duties of the church. The matter of saving individuals requires an economic leveling of society. Not only must the crooked ways of industry be made straight, but the mountains of millionairism must be leveled down, and the valleys of want must be filled up.

What can the Church do.—The christianizing of industry is the most important as well as the most difficult task before the church and the world to-day. The solution of many other problems will depend upon the solution of this one. There is no other discipline that touches life at so many points, and that so vitally affects so many individuals as industry. It reacts upon every individual from the oldest to the youngest, and upon every department of life from the counting-house to the prayer-meeting. It touches the fundamental needs of every individual, of every home, of every congregation, and of every interest in the community. Until industry will become christianized there will be many individuals who cannot be christianized, and there will be whole departments of our life that will remain pagan.

And, very naturally, the world is looking to the Christian church for a contribution to the solution of this problem. The thinking world will not pardon the church for spending her time holding prayer-meetings and collecting benevolent funds while she remains indifferent to the greatest and most difficult of all our problems. The church must include industry within the scope of her redemptive purpose. The principles of the kingdom of God must be made standard and binding for the men in business as well as for the men in the Christian ministry. Business men must do business as well as preachers must preach the Gospel for the sake of service. The church must spare no efforts to create

a business conscience that is as Christian as our church conscience. The church must insist that to be a Christian a man must be as square before the counter of his place of business as he is before the altar of his church.

The principles of the kingdom must, first of all, be applied to the making of money. The church has always had a good deal to say as to how people should spend their money, but she has not been sufficiently concerned about the way people make their money. If a man has given liberally to the church and to charity, the church has praised him without concerning herself very much about the principles or the methods by which the money was made. If a man has given $100,000 to missions, or to a charitable or an educational institution, the church has given him an LL. D. and honored him with a place on the Board of Trustees of half a dozen institutions, although the $100,000 for benevolence may have come from a $1,000,000 which the fellow withheld from his employees and extracted from the helpless public. The charitable way in which a man has spent a little of his money has been made to atone for the dishonest and oft-times inhuman way in which he made it.

During the recent church-wide agitation of stewardship in connection with the preparation for the financial drive of the Forward Movement of the churches, too little was said about righteousness in the making of money. The standard text book on stewardship: "Money the Acid Test," which was studied in the majority of the congregations of thirty denominations, slights the most important part of stewardship. The emphasis which the author places upon the divine requirements in the giving and the spending of money so completely overshadows the references to the divine will in the making of money that the average reader will fail to see that God is very much concerned about how we make our money, *provided we give enough of it to the church.* If a man gives a tenth or more of his income to the church, she, of course, hesitates

to say much about such secondary matters as the payment of unjust wages, or the watering of stock, or profiteering in food and rent. The type of stewardship that stresses only the lesser half of the matter will not be much of a factor in the christianizing of industry. Not until we come to appreciate that honesty and brotherliness in the making of money is a more important thing from the point of view of the kingdom of God than liberality in the giving of money, will our agitation of stewardship become a vital factor in the christianizing of industry.

The church should also encourage and assist all legitimate efforts to ameliorate the hard conditions that prevail under the present system. She should encourage all efforts to bring about necessary changes, and to remove abuses, in the present system. Although it is getting late in the day to begin, the church should use her influence to bring the two contending factors in the industrial conflict into a more fraternal relationship, and into a better understanding of one another and of the real issues involved. Perhaps the worst can still be avoided. Colonel David Carnegie, M. P., England, a man who understands the church, and capital and labor, as well as any man in Europe or America does, feels that it is still possible to bridge the chasm between the contending factions. He feels that certain readjustments can be made that will be permanently satisfactory to all parties concerned. He sees great promise in The Industrial Councils' Plan in Great Britain.[1] I hope he is right. I hope it is possible to poultice the present system so as to relieve the acute irritation. Perhaps the present system can be christianized. We may spare no efforts to christianize it. Hitherto we have not tried to do it.

Christianizing Industry May Require a Change of System.—I confess my personal fears that industry, as it

[1] See: Can the Church and Industry Unite? by Carnegie. See also: The Report of the Whitley Committee.

is constituted at the present time, cannot be christianized. I fear that a profit-system cannot be made to yield to the ideals and purposes of the kingdom of God.

The present system rests upon a pagan foundation, and exists for a pagan purpose. It revolves around profit as surely as the earth revolves around the sun. And I have my personal fears that human nature, at the present stage of its moral evolution, is not strong enough to stand the tremendous strain which a profit-system of industry puts upon it. With big profit offering itself as the reward of dishonesty, too many men will not be strong enough to be honest. With a fortune offering itself as the reward of self-seeking, too many men, I fear, will not be noble enough to seek their brother's welfare. I have faith in the ability of men to respond to the ideals of the kingdom of God under favorable conditions; but I fear that the majority of men are not strong enough to respond to these ideals under the great temptations to which the present system is constantly subjecting them.

Few great leaders of men have been as optimistic in their faith in the average man as was Jesus of Nazareth. But Jesus feared the strength of the shackles which the possession of wealth, or which the fascination of making a fortune, forges around a man's soul. There appears to be a doubt in the mind of Jesus of the possibility of converting a man who has great possessions, or the man who is tempted with the desire or the possibility of making a great fortune. At any rate it is safe to say that Jesus recognized the possession of great wealth, or the possibility of coming into the possession of a great fortune, as the greatest temptation to which a human being can be subjected. Nothing else makes a man so self-sufficient, so independent of God, as great wealth. Nothing else so hardens the human heart,—nothing else is so destructive of the fraternal and sympathetic spirit,—as the desire for or the possession of great wealth. It is harder for such a man to be converted than it is for a camel to go through the

eye of a needle is the doubting judgment of Jesus. It is only through the grace of God that it is possible. And in many a case the grace of God can operate only after the financial barrier is removed. The desire to love one's neighbor as one's self, and the desire to make a fortune for one's self, will not mix—they are moral incompatibles. Either the one or the other desire must vacate the throne.

It is for this reason that I feel that the present system of industry is an obstruction that must be removed before the kingdom of God can come "on earth as it is in heaven." Those business men who are strictly honest and real brothers to their fellow men under a system that encourages them to make all the money that they can make are worthy of our highest admiration. Those who keep for themselves and families only what their service is really worth, and who give their employees all that they really earn, and serve the public with the surplus, deserve to be singled out, not only as noble servants of the kingdom of God, but also as great moral heroes. Such men have overcome the greatest temptations to which poor, weak human nature can be subjected. Not only would the law and public opinion allow them to keep for themselves all that they have surrendered to their employees and devoted to public welfare, but, in addition to these encouragements, all the dudish men and the snobbish women in the community would hail them as "prince charmings" if they would waste their wealth on winter homes and summer homes, on automobiles and yachts, and in fast living. It requires a splendid type of Christian manhood that will be able to withstand such temptations.

Nothing that has been said in these discussions must be interpreted to indicate that I do not believe that there are many individual business men who, by the grace of God, have passed through the eye of the needle. A number of my dearest personal friends, and some of the noblest characters that I know, are successful business men. Perhaps, by the grace of God, all men who are in business can be-

come just and merciful and *real brothers* to their fellow men, even under the awful pressure which the present system puts upon them. But I doubt it. I fear that we have been perpetuating a system of Industry that is subjecting human nature to a moral strain greater than it is able to bear. I am convinced that the system is more to blame for the shortcomings of individuals than the individuals themselves. In many cases an honest attempt to live up to the requirements of the kingdom of God will result in bankruptcy under the present competitive system. A business man may want to pay his employees an efficient-living wage, and to give the public a square deal. But in the buying market he must compete with men who look only to their own profit, and who can buy the raw material as cheap as he can, and perhaps cheaper. While he pays his employees what their labor really adds to the value of the raw material, his competitors purchase labor for the least cent that it is possible to buy it. In the selling market he must again compete with his unscrupulous competitors who can undersell him because they had the same raw material made into the same finished product at a lower cost. Many an honest man who wants to conduct his business according to the principles of the kingdom of God will live himself into bankruptcy under the present competitive system.

I believe that the christianizing of industry will require a change of system just as the christianizing of an individual may require a change of environment. The christianizing of industry,—so I sincerely believe,—requires the substituting of a system that is Christian in its fundamental purpose for the present one which is pagan in its fundamental purpose; a system that aims at service for the public instead of profit for the individual; a system that will substitute the coöperation of all in the interest of all for the competition of individual with individual and of group with group in the selfish interest of the individual or the group; a system that will aim at the just remunera-

tion of all service and the devotion of the surplus earnings to the welfare of the public, instead of a system that pays as little as it must for service and for the patronage of the public, and hoards up the surplus as private capital. The very purpose of such a system, if seriously undertaken, would appeal to the best and noblest in men, while the present system encourages the most selfish in men. Such a system would depend, for its success, upon the stimulation of the divine instincts, while the present system depends for its success upon the encouraging of the animal instincts. The jungle laws of self-preservation and of the survival of the strongest animate the present system, while the kingdom laws of mutual good-will and of social service would have to animate the proposed system.

The adoption of such a system would not be as revolutionary as many good people seem to think. It would simply be the application to industry of the identical principles and methods which we have come to cherish in matters of government. It would be an industrial system of the people, and by the people, and for the people, instead of a system of the few, and by the few, and for the few. The elaboration of details would require time and experience, as has always been the case in the forward movements of popular government. The managers and superintendents of local industries might be elected as we now elect our public school teachers,—the people electing a Board of Directors, and the Board of Directors electing the superintendents and managers. Each community would attend to its own local industries, while the state and the federal government would attend to the basic industries which concern the welfare of all the citizens of the commonwealth, and upon which all local industries depend. A fair and just adjustment of the salaries of the superintendents and the workers, and of the different kinds of service and of the different degrees of skill, would require time and patience, but should offer no great difficulty. The surplus earnings of industry, instead of being amassed as

private capital and spent on private mansions and perpetuated for many generations as private fortunes, would be devoted to the public welfare,— to public buildings, public improvements, and insurance against crop failures, depressions, etc.

If I can read the signs of the times, something on this order is coming whether we like it or not. The popular control of industry is the next forward step in social evolution. Political autocracy has just been driven from its last entrenchments in our modern world at a frightful cost of men and money. Democracy: government of the people, and by the people, and for the people, instead of government by a class of hereditary autocrats in the interest of an autocratic institution, is an established fact in the world of politics. And we cannot expect anything other than this in the world of industry. We cannot expect two counter currents in our modern life: one that moves away from autocracy in matters of government, and one that moves towards it in matters of industry. Such a thing is impossible. Reactionary forces may delay the invasion of the fields of industry by the democratic forces. They may be able to crush, by physical force, the radical movements that would establish some kind of industrial democracy by revolution. But the spirit of the democratic movement will not remain crushed, for the truths of God and the principles of humanity, though crushed to earth, will rise again. Popular government is the logical goal of industrial evolution no less surely than it is of political evolution. Self-government will invade industry. Reasonable men do not expect the new system to spring full-fledged from the old system as Athena is said to have sprung from the head of Zeus. And for the good of the new system we do not want it to come that way. We want it to come naturally and gradually, as things come in this orderly world of God: "first the blade, then the ear, and then the full corn in the ear."

The popular control of industry is our only hope of

salvation from the autocratic control of industry by a class. Industry has always been controlled by a class in the interest of the class. Once it was the great and powerful landlord class that controlled industry. During the last century, especially during the latter half of the century, it was the powerful capitalist class that was in control. And in the future, if we will not popularize the control of industry, it may be the still more powerful laboring class that will be in control. No class has ever been in complete control of things without abusing its power. The landlord class did it; and the capitalist class is doing it; and it is unreasonable to expect that any class of human beings will come into power that will not abuse its privileges. Even the church once abused her privilege when she suddenly came into possession of great power and influence. If we will not popularize industry we may, in the future, suffer from an autocracy of labor that will be as odious as the autocracy of the landlord class was, or as the autocracy of the present capitalist class is. While organized labor in England, Canada, and the United States has thus far declared war only on the capitalist and his system, it does not seem to be friendly to any class outside of its own ranks. In some instances organized labor has not shown any more consideration for the public than the capitalist or the profiteer has. The coal miners do not hesitate to stop the production of coal in the depths of winter; and the railroaders and the longshore-men seem to have no scruples in shutting off the country's food supply to win their own point, no matter how many millions of innocent people are made to suffer. The different branches of organized labor are not very considerate even of one another. Each group seems to be concerned primarily about its own particular interests. It is this group selfishness that has kept the different branches of organized labor from coördinating their forces. In certain sections of Europe the laborer with the soiled hands is making it very uncomfortable for his fellow laborer with

the white collar. The deliverance of industry from the evils of class prejudice and jealousy and the consequent class conflicts demands the democratizing or popularizing of industry.

There is a quite common fear that a popular, or coöperative, system of industry could not be made as efficient as the present system is. It is, of course, a debatable question whether the present system can be called an efficient system. That it is a wasteful system is clear. Its unrestricted competition wastes not only a great deal of useful material, but also a great amount of honest and efficient business effort. The death rate of business enterprises under the present competitive system is almost as great as the death rate of infants in some backward community. It is not possible to estimate the wastage of human effort in the many business failures due to the unrestricted competition of the present system. At present there is no direct way of preventing the overcrowding of those lines of industry which offer most inducements, while other lines, which are equally as important to the community, are undeveloped. One of the leading English authorities on industrial questions said recently that there are a dozen lines of British industries at the present time that are being crowded to death, while a dozen others of equal importance, but which offer less inducement, are waiting for some one to work them. The present system, which is controlled by the one idea of profit, has no way of preventing periodic over-production in certain lines of industry, and the stagnation, and the unemployment, which follow in the wake of over-production. The present lack of coöperation between producer and consumer, between buyer and seller, between the different producing units, and between the different trade centers, has brought about chaos in the business world. It is not possible to estimate the wastage due to this lack of coöperation. And not only is there a great deal of unavoidable wastage, due to the unrestricted competition and the lack of coöperation under the present system,

but there is, in addition to this, also a great deal of deliberate wastage. Veblen has shown very forcibly that sabotage is practiced by employers as well as by employees.[1] If it pays better to waste an article than it does to put it on the market it is wasted. If it pays better to let a carload of potatoes rot, or to cast a ship load of fish back into the sea, than it does to put them on the market, they are wasted. It is a question whether we may call a system efficient whose conduct is governed entirely by the idea of profit.

And in passing judgment upon whatever efficiency capitalism may justly claim, let us not forget that it has had the influence and the money to draft into its service the expert chemists, the expert organizers, and the expert managers and salesmen, as fast as our universities and the other departments of our life have been able to prepare them. Very much of the expert skill of the country is drafted into the service of big business to manufacture and exchange goods with profit for the concern. Some big business concerns have their men who regularly visit certain of our high schools and colleges for the purpose of getting into touch with the brightest and most promising young men, who are offered special inducements to prepare themselves for the service of these business concerns, and who are thus side-tracked from any other purpose or calling that they may have had in mind. By the most subtle inducements, the most promising of our young people are being side-tracked from the Christian ministry, and from the teaching and other liberal professions, and are drafted into the service of grinding out profit for big business. Having the power to eliminate all dangerous competition, and being able to command such expert service, the big stock company or the trust could not well do otherwise than succeed. When Mr. Andrew Carnegie was asked the reason for his phenomenal success, he answered with characteristic frankness: "Because I was always able to sur-

[1] Thursten Veblen, The Instinct of Workmanship and the State of the Industrial Arts.

round myself with men who knew more about the business than I did." Mr. Carnegie's managers, superintendents, and departmental experts were chiefly instrumental in his successful business career, but Mr. Carnegie made most of the money, and got all the credit.

It is hardly a wild fancy to suppose that the same hired experts, who are the real source of the success of the present system, could be enlisted for the same service in a coöperative system. Would not these experts be willing to work for the common public as well as for Mr. Carnegie, or Mr. Gary, or Mr. Schwab? And it is surely not unreasonable to assume that these same experts, who have made the capitalistic system a success, would also make a coöperative system, from which all wasteful and destructive competition would be eliminated, a success. The same fear that is now being expressed about democracy in industry, was very commonly expressed by European critics in regard to our venture in political democracy here in America only a little more than a century ago. But in spite of the fact that we have made no special efforts to develop a class of specialists in matters of government; in spite of the fact that we have been in the habit of electing to public office quite ordinary men,—men who have had no special training for their work,—our system of popular government has been as efficient as the European government by specialists,—*specialists by heredity*. There is no intrinsic reason to fear that self-government in industry would be any less successful than it has been in matters of state. A popular system of industry would naturally make it its business to develop specialists in the different lines of business. It would, in the nature of the case, aim at the culture of a more efficient citizenship in general. This would be one of the fine by-products,—a by-product which in the end would be worth more than the main product,—that we would hope to gain by the change of system.

Fear is also expressed that such a system of industry as the one indicated could not inspire the personal ini-

tiative or the personal efforts that we have under the present system. That means, in plain words, that men would not do their best if a fortune did not offer itself as the reward for their services. It implies that the expert managers and superintendents would not do their best if the possibility of their getting a $100,000 salary, plus the possibility of a bonus, would be removed. But this fear is unmindful of the fact that there are very many people who, in spite of the present profit-tainted atmosphere, are doing their very best for higher reasons than the selfish hope of a big fortune as the reward of their efforts. The artist pursues his work for the love of his art, rather than for the love of the money that he hopes to get for his product. The surgeon does his very best out of consideration for human life, rather than for the sake of the fee. The minister of the Gospel and the teacher in the class room do their very best although they know that their remuneration will never be more than efficient-living requires. The scientist and the inventor spend long days and endless weeks on their tasks, without the hope of a fortune for themselves and families, and without a demand for double pay for over-time and holidays. And not only many individuals but whole departments of our life have risen to that moral stage in their evolution where mere money considerations have ceased to be the controlling motive. Religion, science, art, and philosophy, have all risen above the selfish stage where nothing but money rewards will serve as a motive for the most honest and strenuous service.

And shall industry continue to be the only department of our life that refuses to yield to the ideals and motives of the kingdom of God? Will our brothers in business continue to be the only people who refuse to do their very best unless we allow them to make all the money that they can make legally, and yet a little that may not be quite legal? Shall we continue to consider it impossible to lift the basic struggle for our daily bread into that higher

atmosphere where consideration for one another's welfare and happiness will take the place of the present vulgar and brutalizing desire to make all the money that we can make? I believe that it is possible. We must have faith in the kingdom of God, and faith in men. The main reason why there has not been more unselfish service in business is because the present system does not encourage it. The system is more at fault than the people under it. I believe that the love for public service, and the natural desire for the esteem and good will of one's neighbors, which are controlling motives in a cöoperative system, can be made substitutes for the debasing love of money, which is the curse of the present system. I believe that the presidents of our great railway systems would do their best under a system of government ownership and control. I believe that the heads of our great corporations would, under a cöoperative system, do their very best for a reasonable salary, plus the public esteem and gratitude which their service would merit. If they would not be willing to do their very best when not allowed to make all the money that they can make and bequeath it to their offspring for generations to come, we should not hesitate to classify them, and all others like them, with *the reddest of the red.* Any successful business man who would not be willing to step over into a cöoperative system, in case his fellow citizens should, in a fair and legal way, determine upon such a system, and work as hard as he did when he was reasonably sure of $1,000,000 a year as the reward for his labors, should be classed among the social undesirables.

And it is also argued that such coöperative system of industry would be open to all sorts of political graft and trickery which, in the end, would be as intolerable as the present exploitation of the capitalist. Of course, we would not expect any institution that is made up of ordinary human beings to be free from all evil and abuse. But we know quite well that the main reason for political

crookedness is not the fun of playing the crooked game, but the hope of getting away with a lot of money and using it for one's own purposes. This ulterior motive for graft would be reduced to a minimum by the removal of the possibility of any individual citizen making a big fortune and living in extravagance on the surplus of either his salary or his thefts. In a society in which every man who is not too lazy to work would receive a salary sufficient to live life at its best, but in which no one would receive enough to live in extravagance, it would not be a difficult matter to detect the theft of great sums of public funds. If society would offer no opportunity to spend a big fortune in wasteful ways, and if there were no way of bequeathing a vast fortune to our children and grand-children for them to live in extravagance, the keen edge would be taken from our desire to steal. The keener sense of public duty, and the more stinging condemnation of the betrayal of any public trust, which the coöperative system would foster, would act as a still further deterrent of theft and graft. One of the many agreeable surprises that I experienced in the study of the coöperative business in England and in certain other European countries, was the conspicuous absence of graft and of thefts of public funds. There would undoubtedly be considerable hardship, and some real suffering, because of the readjustments that would have to be made in passing from the present system to a coöperative system. But we should be willing to endure some inconvenience for a generation or two in order that there might be a better world 100 years or 500 years from to-day.

I find many people who agree with all that I have just said, but like Marie Antoinette, they say: "After us, the deluge." Well, the deluge is coming. There are no reactionary forces that can hold out indefinitely against the oncoming tides of social evolution. The present autocratic forces may be sufficinetly entrenched, and may be able to wield sufficient political power, to check their

progress for a while, but turn the tides of evolution backward they cannot. The feeling of dissatisfaction and of grievance on the part of the masses of mankind has been gaining momentum as it has been coming down the centuries, from the fourteenth dynasty of Egypt to the end of the Romanoff rule in Russia and the Hohenzollern rule in Germany. The world will never again be the same as it was before 1914. The war may not have created many new social forces, but it set many pent-up forces free. The passing of the political autocrats from the thrones of Europe will hasten the passing of the autocrats of industry and of finance everywhere. Industry of the people and by the people will follow in the wake of government of the people and by the people. Industry will change hands; and we must get it into safer hands than the hands of a class. The winning of industry for Jesus Christ is the outstanding task of the church of the twentieth century as much as the winning of the Roman empire was the distinguishing task of the church of the first and second centuries.

"Come, clear the way then, clear the way;
Blind creeds and kings have had their day.
Break the dead branches from the path;
Our hope is in the aftermath.
Our hope is in heroic men,
Star-led to build the world again.
To this event the ages ran;
Make way for brotherhood, make way for man."

EVIDENCE THAT THE KINGDOM HAS BEEN COMING

CHAPTER FIVE

EVIDENCE THAT THE KINGDOM HAS BEEN COMING

THE social atmosphere is heavy with selfishness and greed and distrust; but the skies are red with the promise of a fairer tomorrow. The kingdom of God has been coming. The world of to-day is a little better than the world of yesterday; and the world of tomorrow will be a little better than the world of to-day. It may be unwise to point to any particular thing in our life, or to any temporary movement, and say: lo, here, or lo, there, is the kingdom. Nevertheless there are certain sections of our social life that show such clear evidence of a moral evolution that we may point to them and say with confidence: Lo, here, the kingdom has been coming.

I

THE KINGDOM HAS BEEN COMING THROUGH THE MORAL EVOLUTION OF RELIGION AND OF THE INSTITUTION THAT HAS BEEN SERVING ITS PURPOSES

It has been the custom to deduce the evidence for the coming of the kingdom of God from the progress that has been made in the more external matters of the religious program. We have been in the habit of measuring the advent of the kingdom by the number of new converts that have been made, the number of new churches that have been built, and the amount of money that has been raised for religious purposes. These things are an evidence of the coming of the kingdom; but they are not the surest evidence that we have. The kingdom has not always come in the degree that progress was made in

these matters. There were times in the history of the Christian church when her membership was notably increased, and when money was lavishly poured into her coffers, while the real interests of the kingdom of God were not advanced at all. Progress in justice and mercy, in good-will and fair-play among men, has not always been commensurate with the progress of religion and the church. For our evidence that the kingdom has really been coming we must look to the heart of religion and to the soul of the church, rather than to the membership roll and the benevolent register. It is only as religion becomes a holy passion for service, and only as the church becomes a means of relating our religion to our individual and our social life, that the kingdom of God comes in and through religion and the church. It is only as religion and the church will link up their resources in constructive efforts for righteousness that they will further the cause of the kingdom of God, or the brotherhood-world.

And there is evidence that substantial progress has been made in these more fundamental things. Both religion and the organization that has been serving its purposes have been undergoing a process of moral evolution. There is more of the spirit of the kingdom of God in religion and the church to-day than there ever was before. Tradition has pointed us back to a golden age which approximated moral perfection, from which high estate mankind is said to have fallen by transgression. But history, on the contrary, points us back to the crude beginnings of all things, from which there has been a gradual evolution from lower physical, mental, and moral stages to higher stages. And religion shows unmistakable evidence of the same gradual transformation that we see in the other departments of our life. We have made the same moral progress in religion that we have made elsewhere in our life.

The Moral Evolution of Religion.—Religion had its beginnings in essentially selfish motives. Schleiermacher said that religion had its origin in mankind's feeling of absolute dependence upon God. But the God upon whose almightly power primitive mankind felt itself absolutely dependent at so many points was not conceived of as a perfect moral Being, but was the personification of the mysterious and capricious forces of nature, which to-day blessed man and on the morrow cursed him. The first religious response which this feeling of absolute dependence upon capricious Almightiness called forth was not moral, but essentially selfish. On the one hand, religion was merely a contrivance to appease the anger, or to avert the displeasure, of the Deity. Costly sacrifices of fruit and animals, and even children, were offered to prevent the capricious gods from devouring the people with pestilence or drought. On the other hand, costly sacrifices were offered for the selfish purpose of bribing the bribable gods to favor their devotees with good health or good crops. Religion was not consciously related to the moral life of the people. Most of the pagan religions are in this selfish stage of their evolution to-day. Traces of this selfish aspect of primitive religion still cling to the higher forms of religion. Even Christians join the church and say their prayers to keep on the good side of God, whom they do not trust and worship as a perfect moral being.

The second stage in the evolution of religion might be broadly characterized as a feeling of adoration for the mysterious Almightiness upon which man is absolutely dependent at so many points. This stage is reached when mankind comes to that point in its mental evolution where the crude feeling of fear is superseded by the higher emotion of reverent awe of the Almighty Power that is at the heart of the universe. At this stage in his mental and moral evolution man not only recognizes

the power, but also the beauty, the orderliness, and the goodness of the Deity. Religion becomes essentially a feeling of reverent awe before the manifestations of the Deity, and an expression of appreciation of the beneficence of the Deity. It is at this stage of religious evolution that faith builds itself into massive temples of magnificent architecture, and expresses itself in glorious anthems of praise, and in beautiful acts of solemn worship. But religion, even at this stage, is not necessarily moral. All this magnificence of architecture, and this solemnity of ritual, may fail to relate themselves in any vital sense to the character of the individual worshiper, or to the welfare of the community. Religion at this stage of its evolution is essentially non-moral.

The next stage in the upward evolution of religion is reached at that point where it enters as a vital factor into the worshiper's moral life. The worshiper not only appreciates the goodness and the beneficence of God; but he also desires to be what his own moral reason assures him that the good God wants him to be. He feels his dependence upon God in his efforts to be a good man as truly as he does in his efforts to raise a good crop of corn. His religion now becomes an unselfish reaching up to God for the help which he feels that nothing in this world can give him. It is at this point that a man's religion becomes a distinct moral force in his life. But his religion may still be essentially individualistic, and in this respect, selfish. He may still be chiefly concerned about his own temporal and eternal welfare. He loves his God, but he has not yet come to that point of religious excellence where he loves his neighbor as himself. Religion, at this stage, has become a moral force in the worshiper's life; but because it is still essentially individualistic it is only indirectly related to the establishing of the kingdom of God, or the righteous social order—a social order in which every other individual shall, by virtue of his

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOL

sonship of God, have the same privileges and opportunities that I have.

The final stage in the evolution of religion is reached at that point where it becomes a holy passion for social service—a constraining impulse to secure "the abundant life" for every member of the great human family of God,—an irresistible desire to place earth and heaven and all that in them is at the disposal of everybody. This is the sublime height that religion reached in the life and teachings of the Hebrew prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries B. C., and above all in the life and teachings of Jesus of Nazareth. Up toward this sublime height an ever increasing number of religious people have been wending their way. Many of the non-moral and the selfish elements of primitive religion still cling to the religions of to-day—even to the higher forms of religion. But the encouraging thing is the fact that the Protestant religion—the religion that bids fair to dominate the religious life of mankind—feels the impulse of this Christ-like passion for social service. Of all the many motives of Protestant Christianity the strongest is the desire to be of service to humanity.

It is in the fact that religion has been undergoing a process of ethical transformation, rather than in the increase in the number of adherents, that we see real evidence of the coming of the kingdom of God.

The Moral Evolution of the Church.—And not only has religion been undergoing a slow process of moral transformation, but so also has the church, or the institution that has been serving the purposes of religion. There is more of the kingdom-spirit of unselfish service in the church to-day than there has been at any time since the days of the Apostles, especially in the Protestant branch of the Christian church. I spoke frankly, in these discussions, of the church's shortcomings; and of the shortcomings of the Protestant church as well as of

the Catholic church. The church has failed to apply the whole of the Gospel to the whole of life. She has been indifferent to questions of civic unrighteousness and industrial iniquity. She has choked at the gnats in our social life, while she has swallowed the camels with no apparent discomfort. She has been very slow to recognize the full sphere and purpose of her mission. She is still over-emphasizing non-essentials, and slighting the essentials. She is very slow, and in some places even reluctant, to adapt her message and her ministry to the changing conditions of the times. There are individual ministers and individual congregations who willfully do wrong. I expressed my fear that, in certain sections, the church is still deliberately playing into the hands of predatory wealth, rather than championing the cause of righteousness and justice. But in spite of all her shortcomings, and in spite of the deliberate wrongdoings of certain individual ministers and of individual congregations, no one can charge the Protestant church of to-day, as an institution, with deliberate or willful wrongdoing. The sins of the Protestant church of to-day are sins of omission, rather than sins of commission. Her shortcomings, and they are many, are nevertheless matters of the head rather than of the heart. Her mistakes, as an institution, are not a matter of willful perversion, but of a lack of understanding. In her heart of hearts the Protestant church of to-day is sound. Although her theology is out of gear with our modern world, she nevertheless wants to serve. This is the encouraging thing about the ecclesiastical situation to-day. What our Protestant church needs is a change of view-point, rather than a change of heart.

But there was a time when the church did not only need a change of view-point, but also a change of heart. The church in the days of the prophets and Jesus was controlled by selfish rather than by benevolent intentions. The priests and their institution exploited the helpless and superstitious people without an honest effort to ren-

der a real service. The kingdom of God was not in the church then, nor could it come into society through the church. On the contrary, the Jewish church was an obstacle in the way of its coming, and had to be superseded by a new religious organization in order that the coming of the kingdom of God might not be permanently obstructed. Nor was the church of the Middle Ages an instrument of the kingdom of God in any real sense. The Christian church of those days was a self-centered, exploiting institution. She was guilty of deliberate wrongdoing. She was guilty of forgery, of extortion, and of robbery. Heaven and hell were mortgaged to fill the coffers of an apostate church. The people were deliberately kept in ignorance for the purpose of playing upon their superstitions and fears in order to exploit them the more readily in the interests of the priests and their institution. And these mistakes were not of the head, but of the heart. The church was willfully doing wrong. The very soul of the church was bad. The church herself was as much in need of conversion as the world she sought to convert. The kingdom of God was coming then, but it was coming outside of the church, and in spite of the church. The kingdom of God was coming through science and philosophy, through literature and art, through the self-sacrificing labors of men who were stigmatized by the church as atheists and bad men because their views did not harmonize with those of the church. Once more, as in the days of the Jews, an apostate church had to give way to a new religious organization in order that the coming of the kingdom of God might not be retarded.

The situation is quite different to-day, if I understand it. After having fallen from grace during the Middle Ages, the church began to undergo a process of conversion as real and as marked as that of any individual whom she has ever tried to convert. Her conversion began with the Reformation, and the process of regeneration has con-

tinued, with intermittent lapses, down to our own day. The Protestant church has experienced a change of heart during the trying circumstances of the last few years. What the Protestant church of to-day needs is a new vision rather than a new heart,—enlightenment, rather than conversion. The Protestant church of our day, if I understand her, is willing to do her duty as she sees it and understands it; and in this fact lies the real gain that we have made. It is in this change of the heart of the church, rather than in the increase of her membership and her wealth, that we see evidence of the coming of the kingdom of God. The kingdom has been coming into the church; and as it comes into the church, it will also come into our respective communities, and into the world at large, through the church.

But if we look only to the church for our evidence of the coming of the kingdom of God, whether we look to her growth in numbers and in material power, or to her growth in grace, we will confine ourselves to too narrow a circle of influence. The kingdom of God has been coming outside of the church as well as in the church. The church has been influenced as much by the righteous movements which originated in the world outside, as the world has been influenced by those movements that were started by the church. She has not led the way in the onward march of social evolution. She has been following in the paths of the great social movements of history, rather than launching the movements in which the world followed. The forces that finally resulted in the Protestant Reformation and in the breaking up of Mediævalism originated outside of the church—in literature and science—and only gradually, and against much opposition, found their way into the church. The forces that are at this very moment shaking up our semi-pagan social order had their origin outside of the church, and are slowly and timidly finding their way into the church. We are speaking of our

"forward movement" in the interest of social righteousness only after science and literature have urged the matter for a decade or two.

There are certain sections of our social life outside of the church where the principles of the kingdom of God have made marked progress. It may be of some encouragement, especially in these disquieting times, to review these sections briefly in closing. If we will see by what diverse pathways, and by means of what a variety of agencies, the kingdom of God has been coming;—if we will see that there are other than purely religious forces, and other than strictly ecclesiastical agencies at work, it may give us new hope to grapple with the still unsolved problems, and new courage to march on to the still unoccupied territory.

II

THE KINGDOM HAS BEEN COMING THROUGH THE RISE AND SPREAD OF THE DEMOCRATIC SPIRIT

The kingdom of God has been coming in the path of the onward march of the democratic spirit. There is a point where democracy and the kingdom of God may be said to become synonymous terms. When democracy becomes thoroughly sanctified in all its departments,—when it becomes an institution "holy unto the Lord," when it becomes a coöperative society in the interest of the fullest justice and the highest welfare of each individual citizen and of all groups of citizens,—then it is the kingdom of God on earth.

The Progress of Democracy in matters of Government. —Imperfect as government still is, even in the best of states, nevertheless great progress has been made. Primitive society was governed entirely by the jungle laws of the struggle for existence and the survival of the strongest. These unsocial instincts controlled individuals

and groups of individuals. They controlled the conduct of tribes and of races. The struggle for existence produced a natural competition for leadership. We find such competition even among the gregarious animals. And this competition for leadership or for supremacy among individuals and among groups of individuals, resulted in the division of society into classes. Some became rulers and others were ruled; some became masters and owners, and others became servants and slaves. The struggle for existence, and the consequent division of society into classes, was strictly in compliance with nature. It was the struggle of the vegetable and the animal world continued in the world of human society. There is something fascinating and exhilarating about it.

If the struggle between individuals and between groups of individuals had continued in compliance with that fundamental law of nature which gives to each animal according to its ability and perseverance in the struggle, we would have no fault to find with the unequal rewards of our efforts. The rewarding of the struggle of life according to each one's ability and perseverance in the game, is not wrong. If individuals and groups of individuals had continued to take their place in society according to their ability for leadership and their willingness and fitness to serve, no one would be justified to criticise the unequal distribution of the fruits of the social struggle. But the struggle was not continued on the basis of each individual's fitness for leadership, or worthiness of supremacy. Those individuals who had won the place of leadership by virtue of their ability and their perseverance, soon began, by means of artificial contrivances, to fortify and to secure against any future changes, the place or the advantage which they had thus won. Social organizations were formed for the specific purpose of furthering and safe-guarding the advantages of one class to the disadvantage of other classes. In time the children of the different classes no longer began

the struggle for existence on the basis of their individual natural ability, as is the case in the world of nature; but on the higher or lower plane of the advantage or the disadvantage of the class in which they happened to be born.

When society assumed the legal aspect the law itself, in many cases, became an instrument to further the interests of the one class against the rights and privileges of the other class. The laws, as a rule, were made by the leader or victor class; and naturally enough they were made for their special benefit. The dispossessed class, the servants and slaves, had neither voice nor hand in the making or the executing of the laws by which their own interests and lives were governed. And the laws were interpreted and executed by the same class that made them; and it was done in the interest of those by whom and for whom the laws were made. In time the class differences, which had resulted naturally from the primitive struggle for existence, became fixed by law and sanctioned by public opinion. By the natural law of accumulation, assisted by artificial contrivances, the gap between the possessing and the dispossessed classes was constantly widening. Against the division of society into classes on the basis of ability for leadership or qualification and willingness for service, no reasonable man will protest. But against the fortifying and conserving of our advantages from generation to generation by means of artificial contrivances, a practice which makes a fair and legitimate competition impossible, all good men should register their protest. That has made a natural struggle an immoral struggle.

And not only were the advantages of the victor class conserved and protected from generation to generation by artificial means, but the practice was glossed over by the creation of a public sentiment which recognized the right of one class of citizens to subjugate other classes. No one in that unsocial world questioned—or would

dare to question—that some were born to rule and others to be ruled,—that some were born to own and to enjoy the world, and that others were born to toil and to grind. Not only the laws on the statute books, but religion, ethics, and public opinion, all of which were the creatures of the upper classes, placed the different classes of citizens on different planes as human beings. Men were supposed to be born for the different spheres of life, and, consequently, with different rights and privileges. The child born in the home of the king, the landlord, the priest, the soldier, or the scholar, was born with the divine right to the privileges and the enjoyments of life, while the child born in the home of the peasant or the slave, had no rights or privileges at all. Our domestic animals fare better at the hands of our laws than did the great helpless host of slaves, "the hewers of wood and the drawers of water," of the ancient social order. Our society has passed laws to prevent cruelty to the dumb animal that draws the plow; but ancient society had neither statute law nor public sentiment to prevent cruelty to the dumb man who did society's hard and unpleasant work.

In the Roman world, where free citizenship carried with it so many coveted privileges, the inalienable rights of the dispossessed slave class which made up half of the population in the larger cities, were not recognized at all. That noble Roman, the elder Cato, who was universally recognized as one of the model men of his day and country, taught that slaves had no rights which free men had to respect. Even so great and good a man as Marcus Aurelius declared it to be beneath the dignity of a free man to show any pity for a slave, or to exercise any concern for his welfare. One of the Roman noblemen is said to have cut up his old slaves rather than his pigs to feed the fish in his private ponds. There was neither statute law nor public opinion,—there was neither church nor society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, to prevent or to protest such an inhuman act.

The democracy of Pericles of Athens, a fair oasis in the arid desert of ancient class government, affected only the circle of free citizens of Athens. Under Pericles the highest office in the gift of the province, *the archonship*, was open to the lowliest citizens. But the great slave element of the population, those who did all the burdensome work, were excluded from both the privilege and the protection of the laws of otherwise democratic Athens.

Government in the ancient social order, in many cases, was an instrument specially forged for the suppression of one class of people in the interest of another class; and religion, ethics, and public opinion, connived at the evil. Life in organized society had become something quite different from the natural struggle for existence and for leadership. The struggle of the individual and of groups of individuals was no longer rewarded on the basis of ability or of perseverance in the struggle. On the contrary, many who struggled hard and persevered long received nothing but their miserable existence, while many who never did an honest day's toil lived in extravagance and luxury. The kingdom of God, which is a universal brotherhood, cannot come where religion, law, ethics, and public opinion, sanction a fundamental difference between classes of people. The kingdom of God has been able to come only where the rise of the democratic spirit has destroyed the legalizing of class differences and class rights.

But we need not go back to ancient society to find class distinctions woven into the very texture of the law itself. The recognition of fundamental class differences and of the consequent class privileges, was an essential element in the theory of government in the best states of Europe only a few centuries ago. Inequality of class rights and privileges was made a part of the Constitution of the state in the Feudal days of Europe. The supression of the weak by the strong was a right that was granted by the laws on the statute books. The law itself

placed the nobleman, who owned the land, upon a different plane from the peasant, who worked the land. Not only public opinion, but the law of the commonwealth, recognized them as different persons, who had different rights and privileges. For example, the law gave the nobleman the right of trial by a judge and a jury of his own class; but this same privilege was denied the poor man. On the contrary, the poor man was tried by a judge and a jury of the nobility, against whose class the crime was supposed to have been committed, and by whom, and for whose special benefit and protection, the laws were made. There was little chance for the poor man under such conditions. "Imagine," says Rauschenbusch, "that the constitution of Illinois provided that a director of a corporation could be tried only by a jury of corporation officers, and that every public service corporation had the right to operate its own court of justice to settle all difficulties with its employees and the common public, and could put the offensive citizen who protested the size of his gas bill into the corporation jail." [1] Such a thing is inconceivable to one born and reared in America, where democracy has made some progress. But in spirit, that is precisely what was done in the best states of Europe only a few hundred years ago. It was a case where the laws were made, interpreted, and executed by the possessing class and, naturally enough, for their special benefit. The serfs, the great host of ignorant peasants on the fruits of whose patient and ceaseless toiling, the rest of the citizens lived, had no part in the making or the executing of the laws by which their own lives were governed. The Feudal sword of justice had only one edge. It was made and wielded by the nobility with the intention of cutting only in the direction of the poor and helpless. For the identical crime—for example poaching—the poor man was severely punished, while the rich man, for whom "Our Father in heaven" was

[1] Christianizing the Social Order, p. 149.

supposed to have created the game, was not punished at all. There were many crimes for which the poor man received severe punishment, while the rich man received only slight punishment, and very frequently no punishment at all.

The thing that concerns us especially in this discussion is the fact that this injustice was not perpetrated through the evasion of the law, as is still quite frequently done in the best of our modern communities; but it was done by the permission and at the suggestion of the law. The recognition of a fundamental class difference, and the consequent denial of equal rights and privileges to the different classes, was part and parcel of the law itself. The privilege of one class of citizens to exploit and subjugate another class was a right that was granted by the Constitution of the Feudal state. The kingdom of God, which is a brotherhood of all citizens, was barred from the Feudal communities of Europe by this undemocratic spirit which had entrenched itself in the Constitution of the state.

The inequality of rights and privileges of different classes of citizens was legalized in certain undemocratic states even in the twentieth century. In the Russia of the late Czar Nicholas a legal difference was recognized between the nobleman and the peasant. The two classes of citizens did not receive the same punishment for the identical crime. The punishment of the poor man was severe, often cruel, while that of the rich man was light. Russian absolutism was an organized attempt to subjugate and exploit certain classes of citizens in the interest of others. Undemocratic Russia bred its Sovietism and its Bolshevism as naturally as barren soil breeds mullen stalks. Wherever an organized attempt is made to perpetuate the ancient class wrongs in the twentieth century we may expect violent reactions against it. The ferment of the rising democratic spirit will sooner or later blow the corks off of despotic states.

In the Prussia of the late emperor Wilhelm the law placed army officers, government officials, and rich property owners, upon a different plane from ordinary working people. In the Germany of only six years ago, as well as in a few other countries in Europe, class privileges were being perpetuated by means of the plural ballot. By this undemocratic device a few wealthy property owners (no matter by what questionable means their property may have been acquired,) could outvote a whole community on certain questions—even questions that concerned the most vital interests of the masses. In this way the balance of power was kept in the hands of the privileged minority. The plural ballot was a legal means of protecting the interests and the privileges of the minority against the rights of the majority. It is against this kind of unsocial break-water that the tides of the democratic spirit have been pounding for centuries, and the foundations are gradually being washed from under it.

My saying that the kingdom of God has been coming through the rise and spread of the democratic spirit is not inspired by what I have seen of the actual practice of democratic government; for we all know that the practice of government, even in the best of states, is still far from ideal. Partisan politics even in our most democratic communities, is still shamefully corrupt. The encouraging thing, however, is the fact that the modern democratic state rests upon the same fundamental principles upon which the kingdom of God rests, even if the practice of democratic government is still lamentably corrupt and inefficient. The fundamental purpose of democratic government is in accord with the fundamental purpose of the kingdom of God. In theory the institution of democracy is sound. It exists for the sake of service for all. Instead of being the organized expression of a class in the interest of a class, democratic government is the organized expression of the equal rights and privileges of all citizens. The purpose of the democratic state is to govern all the re-

lations of all its people with justice, and to safeguard all the interests of all its citizens. In theory, at least, it is society organized for the purpose of guaranteeing to each individual citizen equal liberty with all other citizens. The glory of democratic government is that it constitutionalizes the equality of rights and privileges of all its citizens. This is a great moral gain over the unsocial class governments of the ancient and the Feudal world, in which the recognition of class differences and of class privileges was woven into the very texture of the law itself. And every gain that we have made in the matter of universal justice is an evidence that the kingdom of God has been coming.

The ends of justice, as we all know, are often defeated in the most democratic communities. We still have class legislation. We still have legislation of "the interests," and by "the interests," and for "the interests." One only needs to study the personnel of our different state legislatures, and especially of the United States Senate and Congress, to see why this is so. We will continue to have class legislation so long as our legislatures are composed of such a preponderating majority of corporation lawyers and of hirelings of big interests. But in a democracy, such as ours, the people have the means at hand to change things if once they will get the sense to do it. This power is no longer systematically denied them as it once was. Some judges, and some courts of justice, still make a difference between the man who has money and the man who has none; or between the blue-blooded aristocrat and the anæmic proletarian. The more money and social prestige a man has the better is his chance to win his case in any legal matter in almost any court of justice even here in the United States. Money can command the services of the shrewdest and most unscrupulous lawyers. And money has the power to postpone the rendering of justice until the poor man has become exhausted. But whatever difference is made be-

tween the rich man and the poor man, in the courts of a democracy, is not made by the explicit right given by the Constitution, as was once almost universally the case. It is the perversion of the law, and not the law itself, that makes a difference between the rich man and the poor man, between the employer and the employee, in a democracy; and herein is the gain that we have made in the matter of justice. The Constitution of the modern democratic state recognizes no fundamental difference of rights and privileges in its citizens. All are recognized as human beings, and all have the same rights before the law. The men who are guilty of making class distinctions in their interpretation or execution of the law cannot claim the constitutional right to do so. It is clear that progress has been made in the matter of justice; and where plain justice comes to its own, lo, there, the kingdom of God has been coming. There may be more substantial evidence that the kingdom of God is coming in the popular indignation over a case of wrested justice, or in the popular demand for the recall of an unjust and dishonest public official, than there is in the enthusiasm over a "Billy Sunday" evangelistic campaign.

Wherever the cause of true democracy has been advanced, whether in the church or in the state, lo, there, the kingdom of God has been coming. When the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1789, only about 120,000 of our 3,000,000 inhabitants had the right of suffrage. The kingdom of God came through the political measures that gave the right of suffrage to all male citizens with a white skin. But in 1861 there were still several million inhabitants of our great free country, who were toiling like beasts of burden for their white masters and for the enrichment of our country, but who were denied all participation in the making and the executing of the laws by which their own life and destiny were determined. The kingdom of God came in the widening spirit of democracy that eliminated the

6415

color line in the matter of suffrage, and which gave this subjugated class the right to participate in the determination of its own destiny, a right which birth as a human being carries with it. The kingdom of God will come in still fuller measure when once we become Christian enough to lay aside our racial prejudice and will extend the helping hand of a real brother to these black children of Our Father in heaven. The Kingdom came, and it will continue to come, through the enfranchising of our 17,000,000 women, who are in all essential respects the equals of us men, and in many respects our superiors, but who were denied the right of their political self-determination on the undemocratic ground that they are women. Those who do not see through their political or theological glasses darkly see more evidence of the coming of the kingdom of God in the enfranchising of our women than in the recent raising of vast sums of money for the church. The entering of the educated woman into public life on an equality with man will add moral leaven to the partisan politics which has turned to corruption in the hands of many generations of male politicians.

In a word then: it is the idealism of its purpose rather than its actual practice that has made political democracy an ally of the kingdom of God. One of the urgent tasks before us is to make the practice of democracy as Christian as its theory. In this christianizing of the practice of government the church can render an important service, and we look to her to do it. Nothing will excuse the church of the future for conniving at or sanctioning the unjust practice of government, as she did in the days of Feudal landlordism, and as she did quite recently in despotic Russia and in bureaucratic Germany. The church was holding elaborate services in the old Feudal communities, and in modern Russia and Germany, but no protest was registered against the iniquitous practice of class legislation. The church either connived at the evil, or, at times, even encouraged it. Of such things she

dare not be guilty in the future. In contributing to the spread of true and efficient democracy the church contributes to the coming of the kingdom of God as really and as effectively as when she holds revival meetings. The kingdom of God and true democracy are coming hand in hand.

The Progress of Democracy in Education.—Democracy in government and democracy in education have been acting and reacting upon each other. On the one hand, the progress of democracy in government has been the cause of the invasion of the field of education by the spirit of democracy; and, on the other hand, the progress of popular education has been the cause of still more democracy in government. The occupation of these important fields by the democratic spirit has been one of the most powerful allies of the kingdom of God. Through no other single channel, not excepting religion, has the kingdom of God been coming into our modern life more than through popular education. No other single agency, not excepting the church, has been a more potent factor in hastening the coming of the kingdom of God than our public schools.

I venture this statement in spite of the quite common feeling in certain religious circles that modern education is essentially irreligious. It is true that the religious instruction that is given in our public schools, from the grade schools on up to our great state universities, equals zero. And it is also true that education in our own country and throughout Europe has become a prey of the commercial spirit. The modern efficiency idea has displaced the old cultural idea in education; and this change in emphasis has not been all gain. While we believe in efficiency, we recognize the danger in the tendency of our times to interpret efficiency too exclusively in terms of mere achievement. We are in danger of losing sight of the personality of the educated man and woman. Our

educational efforts are drifting more and more toward developing men and women who *can do things,* rather than men and women who *are somebody.* The mercenary spirit of the age is corrupting education as it does everything else. To get things done, and to make money through the transaction, is the spirit that controls our modern life; and this spirit has crept into education. The technical schools are drawing the crowds of students today. The courses that are elected in our colleges and universities are those of the applied sciences, or those courses that tend to increase the student's capacity to gain material advantage in the struggle of life and to make money, rather than the courses that tend to increase his capacity to serve humanity. In these respects it may be argued that our modern education is irreligious and unchristian, and that it is furthering the interests of the kingdom of Mammon rather than the interests of the kingdom of God.

But whatever may be said about the present tendency in education, the fault is not with the idea or principle of popular education, nor with the organization that is serving its purpose. The fault is with the mercenary spirit of our times, which has been corrupting everything, —the home and the church, government and education. Our hope is grounded in the plain fact that the spirit and purpose of popular education is Christian. The institution rests upon the kingdom-foundation. The organization that serves the cause of popular education in a democratic state is controlled by the spirit of the kingdom of God. Our public schools seek the welfare of all citizens regardless of race, or class, or sex. Our public schools are the best examples we have of socialized property, and of socialized service. They do not belong to any particular class for their special benefit. They belong to all of us. They exist for the welfare of each one of us. We look at them with just pride and say: "Our schools." They are built and maintained by com-

mon funds. They are supported by a system of taxation, which, in theory, requires from each individual according to his ability for the good of all.

It is the purpose of the schools to develop the highest possible efficiency, not for their own sake, nor to make money for a few school promoters, but solely for the good of all the citizens. And this is strictly in accord with the kingdom of God. Anything that exalts social service above private interests is of the spirit of the kingdom of God. We build substantial school houses and equip them as well as we are able. We make an effort to secure teachers who have prepared themselves for service. And all this is done, not with the pagan idea of making money for any particular class, but for the welfare of all the people. Neither color nor sex, neither poverty nor wealth, nor any other condition, can debar the normal child of an American citizen from the public schools. All that the public schools have to offer is placed at the disposal of any child that will avail itself of the opportunity. This is in strict accord with the fundamental principles of the kingdom of God as I understand them. The fact that the actual results of our public school work are not up to the standard that we may desire,—or the fact that there may be graft connected with the running of certain schools,—is not the fault of the institution of popular education, but of certain pagan elements that have entrenched themselves in our social order. The thing that we rejoice over is the fact that the institution of popular education is so sound at heart. The spirit that animates it is the identical spirit that we have discovered in the prophetic conception of the kingdom of God. I question whether there is any other single thing in our social life that is quite so Christian as the idea and the practice of popular education.

In the field of education the progress of the democratic spirit has been just as marked as in the field of government. There has been a gradual evolution from those dark days when the privilege of education was deliberately

denied to the masses, to the present day when the doors of our public schools are open to the children of all citizens regardless of the accidents of their birth. Throughout the ancient world, the masses,—those who were supposed to have been born to grind and toil,—were systematically denied access to the means of mental culture. They were purposely denied access to the only means by which they could rise from their state of social degradation and misery. Enforced ignorance was one of the means by which their complete subjection was accomplished. In the Roman empire, in its best days, the masses had no school privileges at all. The sons of the upper class Romans were educated under private tutors, or in private schools, and often at great expense; but the lower classes, and all the women, were kept "neighbor to the ox." During the Middle Ages, and far on into the modern period, the privileges of education were monopolized by the upper classes for their own selfish benefit, just as they had always done and are still doing with the other good things of life wherever the democratic spirit has not curbed their power. In many sections of the world to-day, where the influence of Western civilization has not yet made itself felt, the poor in general, and women in particular, are denied their divine right to an education. In Europe and Asia, until only a few centuries ago, women were not granted the privilege of even the rudiments of education. And even here in America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," women, until a generation ago, were denied the opportunity of higher education. Three quarters of a century ago the doors of every college in America were barred against our sisters. Not one college in the country would admit a woman to a single course or privilege.

The kingdom of God has been coming as adequate opportunities for education have been given to all classes of society. We may say: lo, here, the kingdom is coming, wherever adequate school privileges are given to all citizens, rich or poor, male or female, white or black, native

or alien. Wherever the human mind, which is endowed with the power "to think the thoughts of the Creator after Him," is cultivated, lo, there, the kingdom is coming. And especially has the kingdom been coming in the degree that woman has been given the opportunity of an education on an equality with man. Anything that elevates woman, who has very clearly shown herself to be man's mental equal, and in many respects his moral superior, hastens the coming of the kingdom of God. The educated woman in the home, and her advent into the different spheres of public life, will prove one of the most potent factors in the building of a better world.

One of the most damaging charges against the Catholic church is that she has frequently blocked the way of popular education. She did so not only during the dark period of the Middle Ages, but also in the twentieth century, in Russia, in Latin America, and elsewhere, where the democratic spirit has not yet curbed her autocratic power. She has done so in the interest of her static system of theology and her autocratic methods of government, which she knows cannot be maintained in the atmosphere of a liberal education. Any institution, whether she calls herself divine or by any other high sounding name, that checkmates the progress of popular education is an alien force in the kingdom of God.

On the other hand, one of the chief merits of the Protestant church is that she has always championed the cause of popular education. She has been a pioneer in this noble work wherever the frontiers of her missions have penetrated. Nothing augurs more for the kingdom of God at the present time than the organized efforts for a closer coöperation between the churches and the public schools in the education of our youths. It is through the coöperation of the home, the church, and the public schools —particularly the schools—that the type of citizen must be developed who will make democracy safe and efficient.

III

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS COMING THROUGH THE NEW SOCIAL SPIRIT OF OUR TIMES

IT was the spirit of a revolutionary individualism that was reacting against the enforced cosmopolitanism of the old order that gave birth to the new age of the sixteenth century. The aim of the Catholic church was to establish a central authority that would do the thinking and the governing for all mankind. The same religious ideas and practices that satisfied the people of the seventh century were to satisfy the people of the sixteenth century. The identical customs and ideas were to prevail from Rome to Paris, and from Paris to London. But the Catholic scheme of uniformity was contrary to human nature and could not endure. It failed to take cognizance of the individualism that is native to human nature. Men longed to do their own thinking and their own choosing. It was this rising spirit of individualism that brought on the new age. But in the new age that was built on the wreckage of Mediævalism, individualism ran riot. Individuals not only thought for themselves regardless of the authority and the opinion of others, but they also lived for themselves regardless of the rights of others. Individuals and groups of individuals, in defiance of internal compunctions and of external authority, appropriated the world to themselves. Against this extreme individualism, which is the result of the abuse of the principle which gave birth to the new age of the sixteenth century, there is a reaction to-day as keen in its feelings and as conscious of its desires, as was the reaction against the external authority and the enforced uniformity of the latter part of the Middle Ages.

The spirit that characterizes our times is that of a social idealism in contrast to the individualism of the old order. The new social spirit recognizes all the inalienable rights and privileges of the individual. It allows the individual the fullest liberty of self-determination so long as his lib-

erty does not interfere with the rights and the liberties of others. The individual is to do his own thinking and choosing, but always with a just consideration for the rights and the welfare of his fellows. Under the impulse of this social idealism a new standard of conduct is shaping itself. In all our doings, in our private life and in our corporate relationships, we are being judged primarily by our attitude toward our fellow men. Individuals and institutions are being judged by their service to society, rather than by their ability to control things and to accumulate money. Social responsibilities and obligations are being recognized as never before. A new sense of sin is beginning to grip the conscience of individuals and of institutions. The sins that are condemned most universally and most severely are those that affect the lives of the greatest number of people. In our heart of hearts we despise the man who steals a million dollars with the fingers of his monopoly much more than the man who steals a chicken with the fingers of his hands, even if, by a strange contradiction, we commit the ragged chicken thief to the County jail, while we elect the gentleman thief to Congress. Our relation to our fellow men is the ethical norm by which individuals and institutions are beginning to be judged. This restandardization of conduct is one of the most wholesome and encouraging signs of the times. As has always been the case with the things of the Spirit, no one knows exactly whence this new social spirit has come, nor whither it is going; but we do know that its advent is one of the most unmistakable signs of the progress of the kingdom of God.

Much as we lament the war, which prostrated the world with grief and loaded it down with debt, we nevertheless rejoice in the fact that it has helped to quicken the social conscience of the age, and to stimulate our sense of social obligations. The war helped everybody to see and to speak about certain important things which some people were criticised for seeing and speaking about before.

Never before was the profiteering spirit in individuals and in institutions so universally recognized, and so freely criticised, as during our brief participation in the war. Never before was the brutal selfishness which thinks only of enriching itself at the expense of the public so severely condemned. Never before were the evils of class antagonism, and the wastefulness of class competition, so clearly seen and so freely criticised by so many people. For the first time in my memory was there anything like a public sentiment against the many able-bodied men and women—those social parasites—who live on the fat of the land without ever doing a stroke of honest work. The war also showed the need of widening the scope and of stiffening the backbone of government. For the sake of safety in the prosecution of the war, certain basic industries were taken out of the hands of private parties and were placed under the direct control of the government. But if the basic industries cannot be considered safe, in times of war, in the hands of private parties who operate them for the sake of profit for themselves, by what contradictions can we consider them safe in their hands in times of peace?

It would be a great pity if the many social by-products of the war should be left go to waste again. Systematic efforts are being made in high places to swing the world back into the old ruts in which the war found us. The reactionary forces may succeed, for a time, to maintain *the status quo,* because they are still in possession of the balance of political power. But as the rising spirit of individualism won the victory over the powers *that were* in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, so will the spirit of social idealism win the victory over the powers *that be* in the twentieth century. Social evolution may be diverted from its course, but it cannot be kept from its destiny—the rights of humanity.

One of the hopeful signs of the times is that the Christian church is hearing the call and feeling the impulse of the new social spirit. She is catching the social vision.

She is being born again of the Social Spirit of the kingdom of God. The church was taking her Rip Van Winkle nap while epoch-making changes were going on about her. But she is waking up and is rubbing the social drowsiness from her eyes. Perhaps no one appreciates the change that is coming over the church more than those who, fifteen or twenty years ago, were criticised for blazing the way over which multitudes are travelling now with all the noise and display of a street parade. The war served as a refining fire for the church. It shocked her into a sense of her social shortcomings as no amount of friendly criticism was able to do. It helped the thoughtful men of the church, both ministers and laymen, to see that our individualistic, ritualistic, other-world religion has been entirely too ineffective in its inhibitive influence on the mighty onward sweep of the world's political and industrial life. The world was drifting on to shipwreck on the shoals of materialism and mammonism, and the church had created scarcely a ripple to prevent the catastrophe. Thoughtful people see that the failure was not due to a lack of devotion or of earnestness on the part of the church, but to the lack of social leaven in her message and ministry, and to the sectarian divisions which have made of non-effect what little social passion our desocialized religion had created. The critical self-examination which the war forced upon the church, and the penitent confession of her social shortcomings which she is making, are among the great gains of the times. The church's confession of her social shortcomings will, in certain sections at least, be followed by the supplementation of our individualistic religion by the social religion of the kingdom of God.

There are powerful reactionary forces in the church just as there are in the state; and they are making strenuous efforts to swing the church back into the ruts in which she was moving for centuries. But in the church, as in the state, the reactionary forces will not be able to turn the tides of progress backward. The church of to-day is being

caught in a current that is as irresistible as that which resulted in the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century. An organized attempt to quench the social fire that is being kindled in the church, and that is being fanned into a blaze by the draught of the larger social conflagration outside of the church, might mean a repetition of what happened four hundred years ago. It might result in the division of Protestantism into an ultra conservative wing which prefers to pray and to wait till the Lord will come from heaven "to set up his kingdom," and a liberal wing that will endeavor to establish, by the ever-present Lord's help, the kingdom which he has entrusted to us. For the church not to move forward with the oncoming tide of social evolution would be a calamity, for no other agency in society will be able to give the *morale* to the social movement of the age that the Christian church can give it.

The present unrest in the industrial world is not something to be feared, or to be condemned without qualification, much less something to be put down by force; for this too is an evidence of the coming of the kingdom of God and of the diverse pathways by which it is coming. This "cry from the underworld," as some one has termed it, is, in its last analysis, a cry for justice,—for justice which has been withheld too long. Our day of social unrest, of strikes and boycotts, much as we may dislike the rude disturbance of our peace and of our contentment with things as they are, is, nevertheless, far in advance of the days of Feudal serfdom and of chattel slavery. In those days there was no such thing as social unrest, or of organized grievance against oppression. Here and there, in the long course of history, there was a weak peasant reaction against the inhuman conditions that were imposed upon them by their masters. But each time the Boorish disturbance of the peace was brought to a speedy termination by the masters who held all the political and the military power in their own hands. On the whole, the enslaved

masses, all through history, were a patient, long-suffering herd. They did not recognize their divine rights as human beings. They themselves believed the inhuman doctrine, manufactured by their masters, that a few were born to rule, and to enjoy the good things of life, and that all the rest were born to toil and to slave. Under the socially enervating influence of this ungodly doctrine, the toiling masses, like their companions in misery, the dogs, were content with the crumbs which fell from the masters' tables.

But things are different to-day. Popular education has brought a little of the light of the kingdom of God into the souls of the class whose ancestors were enslaved for many generations. The present howling of the mob for their rights,—a howling which is often inflamed and misdirected by their leaders, and which is frequently defiant in spirit and usually materialistic in its aims, is nevertheless the result of the kingdom-life that is germinating in the under-stratum of their developing manhood. If we wish to understand the present social unrest throughout the world we must, on the one hand, recognize the hard conditions under which the laboring class has been obliged to live for a full five thousand years; and we must, on the other hand, appreciate the fact that we have been educating the present generation of laborers sufficiently to see the wrongs which their class has suffered all through the ages. The present social unrest is not only a reaction against the wrongs which this generation of working people is suffering, but against the fact that their class has been exploited since the days when the masses of Egypt became dispossessed of everything but their bodies. We can exploit an ignorant people; but we cannot educate them and continue to exploit them. This is precisely the condition as it confronts us to-day. Popular education and the exploitation of the masses by the classes cannot continue together.

The kingdom of God is coming through every legitimate measure that aims to secure justice and their inalienable

rights for the great host of the world's toilers. They are not beasts of burden, but our brothers,—children of the same God whom we have called: Our Father. Socialism, perhaps even Bolshevism, like the Assyrian and the Babylonian in the days of the prophets, may be an instrument in the hands of the Lord God to chastise an unjust industrial system, a conniving state, and an indifferent church. Socialism, in its last analysis, is an intense passion for that justice which has been denied the masses all through history. The unfortunate thing about it is that it struts around in a materialistic and atheistic garb. To its materialism and its atheism we are firmly opposed, and must continue to be so. With its theory of industrial organization we may or we may not agree. But with its passion for justice for those to whom justice has been denied we cannot help but show our active sympathy if the spirit of the kingdom of God has possession of our hearts. Against the encouragement of violence on the part of some of the social radicals we must not fail to use our influence, for in this they are an obstruction in the way of real and lasting progress. The kingdom of God cannot be taken by violence. But with every legitimate protest against the exploitation of one class of human beings by another class, and with every legitimate move for justice for all classes of men, we must not fail to show our active interest; for these things are harbingers of the coming of the day of God. It is a hopeful sign when human beings show their dissatisfaction with things that are inhuman. It is a hopeful sign when human beings are no longer willing to be beasts of burden for others.

The kingdom of God has been coming, and it will continue to come, in and through every legitimate movement to establish the brotherhood world—a world of justice, of mercy, and of unselfish coöperation in the interest of the highest and fullest life for all mankind. The kingdom was slowly coming in the centuries of the past, and it will continue to come with quicker pace and in fuller measure

in the centuries of the future. One of the encouraging things is the fact that the kingdom of God has not depended upon any one institution or influence in the past, neither will it in the future. It is higher and broader and deeper than all our temporary institutions. Organizations and institutions will pass away, but the kingdom of God will continue to come, for its principles are rooted deep in the moral texture of the universe. Its ideals and motives appeal to that which is best and most enduring in mankind. Slowly, painfully, and with much strife and confusion, humanity has been climbing the steep ascent to that City of Righteousness which the great prophets have seen afar off in their dreams of justice and brotherhood—THE KINGDOM OF GOD ON EARTH, built by the hand of man moved by the Spirit of God. Then:

> "Keep heart, O Comrade; God may be delayed
> By evil, but He suffers no defeat;
> Even as a chance rock in an upland brook
> May change a river's course; and yet no rock—
> No, nor the baffling mountains of the world—
> Can hold it from its destiny the sea.
> God is not foiled; the drift of the World Will
> Is stronger than all wrong. Earth and her years,
> Down joy's bright way, or sorrow's long road,
> Are moving toward the purpose of the Skies."

6415

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EVANGELICAL
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

DATE DUE

BV 601.8 .K747 1922

Kresge, Elijah Everett, 1875
-

The church and the ever-
coming kingdom of God

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BV601.8 .K747 1922
Kresge, Elija The church and the ever-co
3 0645 0004 6892 2